Y 4. H 89 : 99-13

# HUNGER AMONG THE HOMELESS

COMPLETED
298
HF 179

## HEARING

BEFORE THE

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER
## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 6, 1986

**Serial No. 99–13**

Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Hunger

ORIGINAL

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
59-645 O WASHINGTON : 1986

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

1
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

MICKEY LELAND, Texas, *Chairman*

TONY P. HALL, Ohio
BOB TRAXLER, Michigan
LEON E. PANETTA, California
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, South Dakota
VIC FAZIO, California
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, Pennsylvania
SALA BURTON, California
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
BILL EMERSON, Missouri
SID MORRISON, Washington
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
COOPER EVANS, Iowa
ROBERT F. (BOB) SMITH, Oregon
DOUG BEREUTER, Nebraska

---

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

MIRANDA G. KATSOYANNIS, *Chief of Staff*
JOHN D. CUTTELL, *Minority Staff Director*

# CONTENTS


Page

Hearing held in Washington, DC, March 6, 1986 ..... 1

Statement of:

Bode, John W., Assistant Secretary, Food and Consumer Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, accompanied by Christy Schmidt, Office of Analysis and Evaluation ..... 26

Bright, David, a 10-year-old homeless boy from New York City ..... 47

Burton, Hon. Sala, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, opening statement of ..... 4

Curran, Mary, director, Community of Hope Family Shelter, Washington, DC ..... 65

Daily, Margueretta, a young mother of three ..... 54

Emerson, Hon. Bill, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri, opening statement of ..... 5

Ferrell, Trevor, a 15-year-old boy running a homeless shelter, Trevor's Campaign for the Homeless, Ardmore, PA ..... 64

Flynn, Raymond L., mayor, city of Boston, MA, and chair, Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness, U.S. Conference of Mayors, accompanied by Laura DeKover Waxman, assistant executive director ..... 7

Hayes, Robert, counsel, National Coalition for the Homeless, accompanied by David Bright, a 10-year-old homeless boy from New York City ... 46

Leland, Hon. Mickey, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, opening statement of ..... 1

Maz, Veronica, president, Martha's Table ..... 50

Roukema, Hon. Marge, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey, opening statement of ..... 2

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, et cetera:

Addabbo, Hon. Joseph P., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York, prepared statement of ..... 269

Bode, John W., Assistant Secretary, Food and Consumer Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture:

Letter to Chairman Leland, responding to followup question, dated May 23, 1986 ..... 35

Prepared statement of ..... 145

Responses to questions submitted by:

Hon. Mickey Leland ..... 30

Hon. Marge Roukema ..... 34

Bright, David, a 10-year-old homeless boy from New York City, prepared testimony of homeless children from New York City ..... 212

Curran, Mary, director, Community of Hope Family Shelter, Washington, DC:

Prepared statement of ..... 267

Responses to questions submitted by:

Hon. Mickey Leland ..... 66

Hon. Marge Roukema ..... 67

Eccher, Jo-Ann, M.P.H., director, Project Bread Hunger Hotline, Boston MA, prepared statement of ..... 272

Emerson, Hon. Bill, a Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri:

"The Homeless," from the Washington Post:

"Who Are They?", August 25, 1985 ..... 83

"How Many?", August 26, 1985 ..... 88

"Who's Helping?", August 27, 1985 ..... 93

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, et cetera—Continued


Ferrell, Trevor, a 13-year-old boy running a homeless shelter, Trevor's Campaign for the Homeless, Ardmore, PA: Page
A program of personal involvement 253
Background on Trevor's Campaign 261
Mission statement 265
Responses to questions submitted by:
Hon. Mickey Leland 64
Hon. Marge Roukema 64
Suggestions for helping the homeless 259
Trevor offers the homeless a little help from a friend, from Books & Authors, Harper & Row, San Francisco 262
Flynn, Raymond L., mayor of Boston, and chairman, Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness, U.S. Conference of Mayors:
Prepared statement of 98
Responses to questions submitted by:
Hon. Mickey Leland 9
Hon. Marge Roukema 10
"The Growth of Hunger, Homelessness and Poverty in America's Cities in 1985," a 25-city survey, January 1986 103
Hayes, Robert M., counsel, National Coalition for the Homeless:
Homeless Persons' Survival Act of 1986 165
Letter from Hon. Bill Emerson, dated March 19, 1986 209
Letter to Hon. Bill Emerson, dated April 1, 1986 210
Prepared statement of 158
Responses to questions submitted by:
Hon. Mickey Leland 46
Hon. Marge Roukema 47
"Homeless Are Not the Duty of U.S., Reagan Aide Says," from the New York Times, February 19, 1986 277
Hunger among the homeless, background facts, Select Committee on Hunger 76
Koch, Edward I., mayor, the city of New York:
Letter from Chairman Leland, dated March 27, 1986 288
Letter to Chairman Leland, dated April 11, 1986 290
Letter to Select Committee on Hunger, with attachment, dated March 12, 1986 284
Leland, Hon. Mickey, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas, and chairman, Select Committee on Hunger, prepared statement of 72
Maz, Veronica, president, Martha's Table:
Martha's Table restaurant proposal, memorandum, dated June 15, 1984 222
Prepared statement of 213
Proposal for a food stamp pilot project 247
Responses to questions submitted by:
Hon. Mickey Leland 52
Hon. Marge Roukema 53
Panetta, Hon. Leon E., a Representative in Congress from the State of California and chairman, Domestic Task Force, Select Committee on Hunger, prepared statement of 142
Roukema, Hon. Marge, a Representative in Congress from the State of New Jersey, prepared statement of 78
Winick, Myron, professor of nutrition, Columbia University, "Nutritional and Vitamin Deficiency States," excerpt from Health Care of Homeless People 278


BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# HUNGER AMONG THE HOMELESS

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1986

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER,
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:44 a.m., in room 311, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC, Hon. Mickey Leland (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Panetta, Burton, Dorgan, Roukema, Emerson, and Evans.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. MICKEY LELAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Chairman LELAND. Good morning.

The Select Committee on Hunger convenes today to investigate the accessibility of adequate food assistance for the homeless, particularly for the increasing number of homeless families with children.

In establishing the Federal food programs, we made a commitment to the American people that the Government would help feed those who could not help feed themselves. I am sad to say that the series of hearings the select committee has held over the past 2 years reveals that we are not accomplishing this mission. There are many groups within our society who are now vulnerable to hunger. The homeless are one of the worst case examples.

We have just returned from a breakfast site visit at the Pitts Hotel, a temporary shelter providing rooms for approximately 50 homeless families in the District of Columbia and serving meals for over 200 homeless families daily.

I was impressed by the caring and commitment of the workers of the Pitts Hotel, yet the dismal life situations of these parents and children is disturbing. I saw mothers and fathers who travel each day across the city with their belongings, their children and their babies' infant formula, trying to secure food and shelter for the next night.

Here, in the District of Columbia, the number of homeless families provided temporary shelter more than doubled between 1983 and 1985. Last year, the city sheltered 2,170 homeless children and 1,162 parents; 10,000 households are waiting for District of Columbia public housing.

Dr. Myron Winick, professor of nutrition at Columbia University, who has submitted testimony for the record today, states that the homeless population has special nutritional needs that are not being met under present conditions, even for those who are living



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in shelter facilities. Specifically, Dr. Winick has found deficiencies in calories, calcium, iron, vitamins, and minerals among the homeless. For those homeless with chronic health problems, he reports they need special diets or nutritional supplements, not currently available. If homeless children do not receive adequate nutrition, their physical and mental development can be stunted for life.

Mr. Don Johnson, the director of a private nonprofit family shelter at the Star of Hope Mission in Houston, my district, has sent me a letter describing the increasing number of homeless families with children coming to his soup kitchen for meals.

In January, he opened a new shelter for families. The parents and children, he explained, are not getting food stamps, though they are income-eligible. He has been able to provide these families with hot meals, cooked with USDA surplus, donated food, and surplus food from manufacturers and retailers, but he is worried that the supply of donated and low-cost food for the homeless will not continue to meet the need. As the number of hungry families is increasing, he must compete with other private voluntary organizations and food manufacturers for scarce resources.

We have a very distinguished list of witnesses before us today. These individuals represent national and local concerns working to improve life for the poor and homeless.

We also have homeless individuals who can tell us what it is like each day for their families to struggle in obtaining adequate food and shelter.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Leland appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 72.]

Chairman LELAND. Let me now turn to my colleagues and ask if they would have opening statements. First, of course, to my ranking minority member, the Honorable Marge Roukema from New Jersey.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. MARGE ROUKEMA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I do have a fairly extensive statement, which I would like to have entered into the record in its entirety.

Chairman LELAND. Without objection.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I am most anxious to participate in this hearing today.

As a member of both the Select Committee on Hunger and the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, I am particularly interested in today's testimony.

Some of the most disturbing problems in America today are demonstrated by the thousands of people who live in our streets and in our shelters. They are there for a myriad of psychological, emotional, and economic reasons. Homelessness is distressing and unsettling to discuss because the discussion holds up a mirror to the face of society. And like Snow White's wicked stepmother, we do not like the ugly facts we see. These facts all seem to come together on the subject of the homeless.

Those who are currently homeless are not a homogenous group, and the reasons for their homelessness are numerous.

Today's homeless include those with alcohol and drug abuse problems, those with mental health problems, women as well as men, families as well as single persons, people who have never been employed and people who are recently unemployed, and people of all races and ethnic backgrounds.

There are many trends occurring in our society which have contributed to the problems of homelessness. These include the results of the changes in the sexual and social mores of our society, such as the high divorce rate and increased teenage pregnancy; economic dislocation due to deindustrialization and the increase in high-technology industries; the loss of inexpensive public housing because of urban redevelopment; and increased drug and alcohol use.

Most importantly, however, and the issue that I think has been underdiscussed, is the policy of deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill and the nonadmission of mentally ill persons to institutions. I believe this policy has had the greatest impact upon homelessness in our country.

There have been several studies which have shown that a significant portion—anywhere from 25 to 90 percent—of the homeless are mentally ill. In addition, many have psychological problems associated with drug and alcohol dependency.

The deinstitutionalization movement, begun in the 1960's, was designed to create a more humane mental health system and as a perceived reform of civil libertarians. But it has been an abject failure resulting in many mentally ill persons ending up on the streets or in the shelters. It has fundamentally altered the characteristics of our homeless population.

Initially, the majority of persons who were chronically mentally ill and who became homeless were middle aged and had been hospitalized for lengthy periods. But, most recently, young persons who have had little or no contact with mental health services at all have become part of the homeless population.

Many of the homeless mentally ill can cope only to a limited extent with the demands of life, and because of their strong dependency needs, most cannot live independently. Many mental health professionals are now recognizing that a number of severely disabled patients can survive and have their basic needs met only if they have sufficiently structured community facilities or other mechanisms to provide support. But this kind of support is not readily available in all communities; in fact, in most communities, it is not available.

Although shelters save lives, and this is a subject we are here to discuss today, they do not provide the kind of assistance that these mentally ill individuals need. The shelter approach, although necessary as a stopgap measure, does not address the basic problems of the homeless mentally ill. Vital community services are necessary as are changes in the legal system that will facilitate involuntary treatment.

Now, certainly, economic circumstances have contributed to the homeless problem, Mr. Chairman, and my comments there closely mirror your testimony, so I will omit them in my oral statement.

But I do want to say that although the private sector is often better suited to respond to the needs of the homeless, it is clear that there is an important role for all levels of government.

The Federal Government maintains a number of programs which provide funding and resources to both individuals and organizations assisting the homeless, and today we will hear from one of those organizations. USDA Assistant Secretary John Bode will talk with us about the different food assistance programs available to meet these needs.

In addition, I had hoped that we would hear from the Department of Health and Human Services interagency task force on food and shelter for the homeless. The task force has been working on this subject of bureaucracy and redtape, but it is my understanding that task force members were unable to be here today. However, I hope that Assistant Secretary Bode is able to address himself to this issue.

In conclusion, Federal, State, local, and private efforts can be improved without question. But this is my point today—we must make sure that we begin to address the very complex root causes of the problems or we are not dealing with the real issues of homelessness and hunger.

And, to that end, Mr. Chairman, I would urge that the committee continue to hold at least one hearing specifically and exclusively devoted to the myriad numbers of problems that have been created by deinstitutionalization.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mrs. Roukema appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 78.]

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Mrs. Roukema.

The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from California, Mrs. Burton.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. SALA BURTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. BURTON. I have a brief statement, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for holding these hearings. Clearly, the problem of the homeless cannot be separated from the problem of hunger.

As we know, both hunger and homelessness are on the rise. I read only yesterday of a survey funded by Ralston Purina Trust Fund, which found that at least 1.5 million people in 36 metropolitan areas are hungry because Federal and private programs are failing to meet their needs.

In my congressional district, which is the city of San Francisco, Glide Memorial Church, where the Select Committee on Hunger held one of its first field hearings, now serves 12,000 free meals a day. As you may recall, when we made our visit, Glide was serving 3,000 meals a day. It sounds unbelievable, but 12,000 free meals a day.

Officials at Glide told me that if the current trend of program and budget cutbacks continues, there will be a 20-percent increase in the number of people in the food lines by the end of 1986, and a 30-percent increase by the end of 1987.

The city government in San Francisco houses approximately 2,400 people per night in 26 hotels and 4 mass shelters. Of the persons in those shelters, 220 are families with 600 children. Families

with 600 children. This does not, obviously, count the large numbers of homeless that are cared for in some way by private charitable institutions.

The city of San Francisco estimates that there are roughly 3,000 homeless individuals with no access to shelter of any kind. These numbers are probably greater because of San Francisco's special status as a major point of entry for refugees. Refugees often avoid official agencies and remain uncounted and unserved.

Ten years ago, St. Anthony's dining room saw 50 women and children per day. This winter, the figure is close to 600. A special dining section just for women and children had to be created 1½ years ago. St. Anthony's also reports more and more children coming to the dining room during school hours.

Mr. Chairman, San Francisco mirrors something that is a nationwide phenomenon. We are a prosperous Nation, but what we are seeing is an ominous fraying of our social fabric. We cannot allow people to go hungry and homeless in the streets of our Nation.

Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Mrs. Burton.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Emerson.

## OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. BILL EMERSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. EMERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Our hearing today focuses on the issue of hunger among the homeless.

I am particularly pleased to welcome this morning Mayor Flynn, the mayor of Boston. Mayor Flynn is quite knowledgeable on the subject. I know that he recalls the hearing held in Boston by the Nutrition Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee and our tour of some of the sites in Boston that provide help to the homeless.

This issue of homelessness is a very complex one. Even counting the number of the homeless is controversial. Added to that is the issue of what groups comprise the homeless and what is the best way to provide help to these people.

Last summer, the Washington Post published a very interesting series of articles on the issue of the homeless, which I would like to include for the record and which I ask permission to do, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LELAND. Without objection.

Mr. EMERSON. I urge members to read this series of articles. The causes of homelessness are many and varied. Family disputes, mental illness, lack of jobs, some of which defy government solution.

In addition, low-cost housing, once available in many cities, has disappeared, in some cases, due to downtown projects and the revitalization of major cities. Affordable housing may no longer exist in specific areas. Solutions to these problems and to the homelessness issue are difficult to come by.

I certainly hope that our witnesses today will have some suggestions to offer.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Food Stamp Program is one Federal program that is available to the homeless. The Food Stamp Act sets forth, among other provisions, the eligibility criteria for persons applying for food stamp benefits.

The President's Task Force on Food Assistance recommended that action be taken to ensure the eligibility of the homeless for food stamps. The task force found that homelessness is a symptom of complex problems and as the report concluded, "Until we possess the means to deal with them as a whole, food assistance will remain a most necessary and important source of help for these unfortunate people."

Any action to deny food stamp eligibility to any person simply because he or she has no fixed address is not provided for in the act. However, it is important to clarify this eligibility, especially since the task force found that 19 States require a fixed household address in order for an applicant household to be eligible for food stamps. This group of people, the homeless, have problems other than the need for food assistance.

While the need for food is basic and the Food Stamp Program is available to help meet it, additional measures are necessary to resolve the problems of those without homes. While there is a need to ensure that the homeless are not denied benefits solely due to a lack of a fixed address, we must emphasize the need for States to take care that food stamp eligibility factors are met before benefits are made available to such applicants.

States may have used the fixed address as a means to protect against multiple participation of households in the Food Stamp Program. While the absence of a fixed address does not preclude food stamp eligibility, neither does it relieve the State of its responsibility to protect against abuse of the Food Stamp Program, including the use of the system to prevent duplicate participation in more than one jurisdiction. Consequently, the 1985 farm bill does clarify this issue of the Food Stamp Program and the eligibility of the homeless for benefits. The farm bill requires States to provide a method of certifying and issuing coupons to eligible households that do not reside in permanent dwellings or who do not have fixed mailing addresses.

In carrying out this requirement, the State must take such steps as are necessary to ensure the participation in the Food Stamp Program is limited to eligible households.

In March 1983, $300 million was provided under the Emergency Food and Shelter Program to help the homeless. Millions more in dollars and services are certainly provided by States and local governments and private charities, and, yet, the problem is not corrected.

Allow me to quote from the series of articles that I previously mentioned. "It's best to take their money but not to take their system," said Cindy Abbott, director of the Depo Shelter, Pasadena, CA, which has some Federal support. "Even the Federal requirements for accepting funds often miss the point of what we're doing and volunteers are less likely to get burned out than Federal workers," she said. "Her experience and the Government's failure to do much more than try to keep the homeless sheltered and fed has

appeared to add strength to the many voices arguing the Government should curb its instinct to act in such cases."

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The series of newspaper articles referred to above appear at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 83.]

Chairman LELAND. Thank you very much.

The Chair would like to now call the first witness, Mayor Raymond Flynn, who is the chairperson of the task force on hunger and homeless for the U.S. Conference of Mayors and, of course, he is a good friend and the mayor of the city of Boston, MA.

Mr. Mayor, thank you for being with us today.

**STATEMENT OF RAYMOND L. FLYNN, MAYOR, CITY OF BOSTON, MA, AND CHAIR, TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, ACCOMPANIED BY LAURA DeKOVER WAXMAN, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Members of the committee, I am very happy to be here today to represent the U.S. Conference of Mayors, to give our observations about the severity of the growing problems of hunger and homelessness and poverty in American cities.

At the outset, I would like to introduce Laura Waxman from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, a staff person who will assist me in any information that this committee may need.

At the outset, let me say that I am particularly pleased that this committee has developed a hands-on approach to this problem. You are not satisfied merely listening to testimony, as important as it is, but also have gone out into the cities of our country to see firsthand the severity of the problem.

For that reason, we thank you very, very much.

Chairman Leland and members of the committee, I am privileged to appear before you today, again, on behalf of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. As my submissions to the committee indicate, people in America's cities are hungry and they are hungry because this Nation is abandoning programs that enable us in cities and States to support poor and working families in their pursuit of affordable food and shelter.

Hunger is a stealthy, silent enemy. It gnaws unseen at millions in our cities. It is pain cutting across the lines of age, ethnicity, and family structure. It is not just an elderly peoples' problem, though elderly are, in fact, hungry. It is not just a poor peoples' problem, though millions of children and adults are going without.

Hunger is America's problem and that is why we appeal to the Congress for leadership and support to end it.

Mr. Chairman, in January, as head of the U.S. Conference of Mayors Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness, it was my sad duty to report that hunger and homelessness are still increasing dramatically in America's cities.

In 1985, the demand for emergency food assistance increased in all but 1 of the 75 task force cities surveyed, and it is expected to increase again in all but 3 cities in 1986. Those statistics are con-

tained right here in a report that was conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors of 25 major cities in our country.

On the average, 17 percent of the emergency food assistance needs go unmet. City governments are doing what they can, but the administration is robbing the pantry.

We see growing numbers of women and children being pushed into poverty and hunger by a combination, as one of the Congresswomen indicated, by a combination of high housing costs, widespread underemployment, and the reality of thousands of Americans being knocked off the eligibility list for vital public assistance programs.

I think that we ought to take a real good look at that because, as I have indicated, it is not so much an act of the Congress that this is taking place, it is the change in regulations by the bureaucracies of the Federal Government that are making less people eligible for these very important public assistance programs.

They were established by the Congress of the United States, but the regulations are being changed by the bureaucracy to make less people eligible; therefore, putting more people into the category of poverty—or near poverty.

As we gather here today, farmers all across America are looking forward to planting and harvesting another season of crops, but many of those farmers and those who depend upon them must look forward with fear, afraid of a bitter harvest or none at all. Because the fiscal year 1987 Federal budget promises full missile silos, but not full of corn silos.

While we witness an 8 percent after inflation increase in the military spending, the proposed fiscal year 1987 budget presents a cut of over $1 billion—$1 billion—in nutrition assistance programs.

The School Lunch Program and Breakfast Programs, the Child Care Programs, the WIC Program, the Food Stamp Program, the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program, and the Emergency Food and Shelter Program—all are slated for cuts, elimination or change.

When it comes to poverty in America, those Americans first asked to bear the brunt of the Federal deficit reduction effort are women and children. The Federal Government has given new meaning to the phrase "women and children first."

The proposed fiscal year 1987 Federal budget is more direct evidence of the two-tiered society, that our national leadership is constructing. On the top tier, we find a Federal Government more concerned with lowering corporate tax rates and increasing the prosperity of the wealthy. While on the bottom tier, we find families struggling to put food on the table.

Even though they are employed, they are often underemployed and jobs that do not pay enough to keep pace with the spiraling costs of housing and other family needs.

On the top tier, the wealthy have the luxury of worrying about how the Federal programs will affect their rates of interest on their trust funds. On the bottom tier, we are confronted by the rates of poverty, of hunger, and of infant mortality, that are driven by cuts in those Federal programs.

Every conscientious American must be concerned about the national deficit, but we must remember that it was not the poor and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

working families who caused this record deficit. It was the combination of imprudent 1981 tax cuts, the interest on the deficit itself, the unprecedented military appropriations, which the Pentagon itself cannot figure out how to spend.

The fact is that the Pentagon now has $58 billion left over from the previous authorizations by Congress, a surplus that could equal the amount of money that the Gramm-Rudman proposal requires we cut by October 1.

In closing, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, let me state on behalf of the mayors that running a major city requires resourcefulness and dedication that demands fiscal discipline and it demands the making of difficult and sometimes very unpopular choices.

As mayors, we demand no more from our representatives in Washington than we ask of ourselves, but we will tolerate no less. The fact remains that the words hunger and America should not be allowed to exist together, whether in testimony or text.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

Let me just point out that as I was coming here this morning, a person who works for the city of Boston, our representative here in Washington, DC, just so happened to be picking me up at the hotel and taking me here to testify.

He had to make a stop at a place called SOME. It is a shelter that feeds 1,000 people right here everyday. It is called So Others May Eat, and a number of churches throughout the area put food together and bring this food down to the shelter each day. They feed over 1,000 people each day right here in the shadow of the Nation's Capital, in a city that represents all that is great in this country and this world today. Again, I know that it is not the intention of this committee, because your commitment, your dedication is clear, and I do not think it is the attitude of the Congress or the President of the United States, to be direct with you, but the reality is that this is what is occurring.

It can be changed. It must be changed. Those decisions are in your hands. Those decisions, I think, are being made by people of good conscience, but people of good conscience have to understand the impact that their vote is having on increased poverty and homelessness in America.

I urge this committee to provide the leadership to the Congress and to the President of the United States so that America can be once again the country that it was established to become, a home for people who have been disenfranchised, a home for people who have been left behind.

I urge you to take that creative leadership and to make that strong moral choice.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Flynn appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 98.]

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR RAYMOND L. FLYNN

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MICKEY LELAND

*Question.* To what extent has the FEMA Program been key in assuring the maintenance and/or expansion of privately funded services for the homeless? What spe-

COPY AVAILABLE

cific projects or food resources has the FEMA Program provided for the homeless in Boston? What would happen to these private voluntary efforts if FEMA funds were discontinued?

Answer. It is extremely difficult to assess the impact of FEMA funds alone because the amount of money it has provided is modest. This past year the allocation to Suffolk County dropped by $10,000 to $208,000. The average grant to the agencies range from $2,000 to $5,000.

The moneys have traditionally gone to programs that provide direct services to homeless persons. These programs are shelters, soup kitchens, elderly feeding programs, and day programs.

Those 66 agencies receiving money in Suffolk County are private nonprofits that depend upon volunteers, but many have full-time staff. Because the money being offered is small, no agency has come to depend upon it for its existence. However, given the limited budgets of many of the agencies, the loss of the grant would result in reduced services or require additional fundraising.

I would also suggest that efforts to restore the FEMA Program provide better targeting to larger cities, which bear most of the burden for housing and providing services to the homeless.

*Question.* Has the city food stamp office issued any memos to local Boston food stamp offices regarding the need to assure eligible homeless people are certified for food stamps?

Answer. A memo dated February 7, 1985 from the central office of the State Department of Welfare to their local offices instructed them that homeless individuals have a right to food stamps. People do not need a specific address to receive this benefit. However, those who reside in shelters are being denied this benefit because meals are available at the shelters.

On May 1, 1986 a memo will go out to local offices indicating that food stamps will be made available to adults in shelters.

*Question.* Have there been any conflicts between the local, State, and regional USDA offices regarding the interpretation of Federal food stamp regulations relating to eligibility for the homeless?

Answer. The Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare is aggressively attempting to distribute food stamps to all homeless adults, and on a case-by-case basis, for homeless families in shelters.

*Question.* Has the regional office provided you with any technical assistance to assure eligible homeless persons receive food stamp benefits?

Answer. The Federal office stopped paying for all outreach and information services in 1981. In Massachusetts, Project Bread and the National Ad Councii have teamed up to provide this service.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

*Question.* I understand that in 1983 Governor Dukakis identified homelessness as his top social welfare priority in Massachusetts and instituted a number of changes aimed at providing more humane care for the homeless. Please detail the changes made to assist the homeless in Boston as a result of the Governor's priority.

Answer. In January 1986, the Governor announced plans for 373 new beds and up to 144 backup beds to care for the homeless mentally ill in Boston. This announcement brought the total number of State funded beds for the homeless and the mentally ill in Boston to 1,250.

The plan included $300,000 in additional funds to the city operated shelter at Long Island for backup beds, when the city's shelters are full. The city of Boston has an ongoing commitment to providing food and shelter for its homeless people and has supported legislation to provide additional State funding for this purpose.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts recently enacted the largest public housing bond issue in history to provide additional low-income housing. Additionally, chapter 707 housing subsidies are now to be made available to at risk individuals to help prevent homelessness.

*Question.* Mr. Flynn, can you please tell me if there are any efforts underway in Boston to address the problems of the homeless mentally ill? Certainly, these persons need more than increased shelter and food assistance, and many times there is a profound gap between the needs of the homeless and the capacity of the social-welfare system to provide care.

Answer. Boston's Emergency Shelter Commission has estimated that approximately one-third of shelter guests are mentally ill. The State's Department of Mental Health is responsible for identifying and obtaining treatment for them. The DMH Homeless Outreach Team assesses guests thought to be mentally ill and con-

nects them with services at one of the six mental health centers in Boston. However, most shelter directors believe that a team of five individuals cannot bring the necessary case management to this undertaking.

Recently, DMH secured a grant to provide psychiatric nurses to the three largest shelters and the largest day program. This may somewhat improve the situation.

The city of Boston is currently preparing a cosubmission with DMH to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for a grant targeted to improve comprehensive provision of mental health services in major urban areas. The city will make a commitment of city-owned buildings for the provision of housing.

*Question.* If you discover that a local agency is denying food stamps to a person without a fixed address, do you make the Food Nutrition Service aware of this so that it may take appropriate action?

Answer. The Department of Public Welfare is supportive of the policy of allocating food stamps to homeless people, so this is not a significant problem. If this should occur, DPW client services would be responsible for ensuring the local office informs its workers of this policy. FNS does not take a significant role in this area.

*Question.* Are there any efforts underway to determine what Federal benefits for which the homeless in Boston are eligible? There certainly is no reason for a person not to attain benefits for which they are eligible, and the local level should be assisting in this effort.

Answer. The Shelter Commission has focused attention on SSI and veteran benefits with the result being that St. Francis House will become the agency where people can obtain information about and apply for SSI.

Veteran services of the city will begin outreach with the shelters to ensure that eligible veterans will receive benefits.

*Question.* Massachusetts has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the Nation. Hasn't the increased employment in your State had an impact on the problem of homelessness? Please explain.

Answer. The economic vigor in Massachusetts and its resultant low unemployment rate have had an effect on homelessness, but not always in ways that you would expect. The Massachusetts Coalition for the Homeless says that about half of Boston's estimated 6,000 homeless people are employed. Their problem is in finding and keeping a job that will allow them to compete for a unit in Boston's high-priced rental housing market. Thirty years ago the city had 24,000 rooming houses which offered affordable accommodations to those earning low wages. In 1986 we have 221 rooming houses, and the market pressure toward gentrification of these buildings is great.

Boston is experiencing an affordability crisis in housing for all low- and moderate-income residents. The worst of the burden falls on the lowest wage earners. Given that a high percentage of shelter guests are incapable of maintaining regular employment due to mental illness or such problems as substance abuse, the chances for most homeless individuals to move directly into the unsubsidized housing market are small.

*Question.* I believe that the problem of homelessness is very complex, and requires a concerted Federal, local, State, and private effort. Keeping in mind the huge Federal deficit, do you have any recommendations that would allow for greater cooperation among the different levels of government and the private sector?

Answer. Housing the homeless must become a concern for everyone. Government must act in partnership with organizations and individuals to provide shelter and services. Shelters that combine both government and private resources are able to provide the best care.

One of the most important priorities that all levels of government should have is the provision of safe, decent, and affordable housing to all those in need. Even with a large Federal deficit, Congress still makes choices of which programs to fund, whether domestic aid, foreign aid, or defense. While the Federal Government should not be bearing this responsibility alone, nor should it be enacting massive cuts in assisted housing, health care, and other programs that aid the homeless.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors' Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness, which I chair, is currently compiling a case study report of successful approaches to combat homelessness around the country. I will be happy to share that report with you when it is issued in June.

*Question.* How has the city of Boston used its CDBG allocation?

Answer. The city of Boston's 1985–86 CDBG allocation was $22.367 million. Housing programs receive $12 million, 54 percent; development programs receive $2.3 million, 10 percent; human services $4 million, 18 percent; and administration $4 million, 18 percent. The $12 million housing allotment is distributed in the following

manner: abandoned housing, $6.6 million; new construction, $0.5 million; homeowner rehabilitation, $3.2 million; and Gap financing, $1.7 million.

In a city with a 2-percent vacancy rate, it is necessary for us to increasingly shift our housing resources to affordable housing production. The city is committed to solving the public crisis of homelessness and approximately $1 million of CDBG funds are specifically targeted for homelessness solutions.

The Boston Housing Partnership has administered $4 million to help restore 700 vacant and deteriorating units through the city's partnership with the State and private sector.

A survey conducted by the National Community Development Association during January 1986 confirmed that the city of Boston uses its CDBG to fund organizations that are largely nonprofit. These groups provide critical services to needy people.

The City of Boston stands to lose $6.9 million in CDBG if deferral takes place.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for your contribution.

Let me ask you a few questions. First the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, James Miller, testified last month before the House Budget Committee, saying, and I quote, "The homeless are not a Federal responsibility, but a State and local responsibility." To what extent are the causes and treatments of homelessness a Federal versus a State or local responsibility?

Mr. FLYNN. I think it was a very unfortunate statement, because the issue of homelessness and hunger, poverty and the needs of disenfranchised people, are everybody's responsibility. It is not the Federal Government's responsibility alone any more than it is the city or the State's responsibility, any more than it is Government alone.

It is all of our responsibility, and we must assume that responsibility, and I do not believe Mr. Miller really meant what he said, but the way it came out was that it was not the Federal Government's responsibility—that the Federal Government was no longer participating in those kind of concerns. It is, in fact, a partnership that must be developed among all layers of government and the private community as well.

It is because of changing regulations for nutrition programs, a dramatic reduction in housing subsidies. I can tell you that for people familiar with the Boston area or New York or the lady talking about San Francisco—the Congresswoman was absolutely right about deinstitutionalization. It is deinstitutionalization. And it is also housing costs. It is changes in regulations. In Boston it is housing costs. We have a very healthy pride in developing cities, but it is like that Charles Dickens line, from the "Tale of Two Cities," with that growth and with that prosperity comes—the best of times and the worst of times. It puts pressure on the housing stock.

People who, for example, are on a fixed income—Social Security or SSI—are paying a growing and disproportionate amount of their income for housing. In Boston, housing last year, in the last 2 years, went up 72 percent. This past year, it went up 38 percent.

San Francisco, the same situation. Orange County, New York City, and, yet, these are the same areas that have a growing population of homeless people.

Those are the major reasons why there is, in fact, a growing new poor. And it is not just the deinstitutionalized people; it is families that are falling below the poverty level. The people that we saw today. Yes, indeed, a good portion of them were mentally ill homeless, but all were families.

AVAILABLE

In Boston, we are seeing a great need for family shelters because people cannot keep up with the high cost of housing and they are not eligible for the various programs.

So, I just believe that Mr. Miller's comments were very unfortunate because, in fact, it is all of our responsibility, whether we hold the highest office in the land in the greatest nation in the world, or we are an average person going to work each day. It is all of our responsibility, and the Federal Government cannot turn its back on those kind of concerns and say that it is somebody else's responsibility.

This Government and our elected officials have stood by wars and turmoil and turbulence, and they certainly should be able to stand by the people who are poor.

Chairman LELAND. Mr. Mayor, are you aware of any regulations from USDA that present barriers to participation in the Food Stamp Program for the homeless?

Mr. FLYNN. I know that the question has come up about the eligibility of homeless people for food stamps.

I was glad to hear the Congressperson address this issue. What was happening is homeless people who were in shelters were not eligible for food stamps because they did not have a permanent address. They would like to have a permanent address and they would like to be eligible for food stamps. By the way, if you look at the fiscal year 1987 budget presented by the President, you will find that there are dramatic cuts in section 8 programs, 202, other kinds of Federal programs that provide housing assistance to working families in our country.

Allowing homeless people to be eligible for food stamps who are in institutions is, in fact, very appropriate and very much needed. I have heard that from a number of mayors. Those kind of regulations must be changed. I know the Congressman from New York City has introduced H.R. 770. The Homeless Protection Act, to permit homeless food stamp recipients to purchase meals in restaurants, for example, with food stamps. This is an important piece of legislation.

Chairman LELAND. How do Federal programs, such as the community services block grant, community development block grant, the general revenue sharing, and the Emergency Food and Shelter Program foster successful local and private efforts to feed and shelter the homeless?

Mr. FLYNN. It is a very good question.

Just yesterday, before I came down here, I received a letter from HUD, and it said that Boston was getting a 30-percent reduction in its community development block grant money.

Let me tell you what the community development block grant money is used for. We use it to start up child care programs. Congressman Emerson was at St. Francis House in Boston, run by the Catholic Church, and we give them, out of community development block grant money, a modest amount of money. The Congressman saw it firsthand: the wonderful work that countless hundreds of volunteers do feeding people each and every single day, not just on Thanksgiving or Christmas in the glitter of the television cameras, but every single day.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We are able to assist that kind of program with financial help. That is what we do with our community development block grant money. A 30-percent reduction is really going to impact severely what we are trying to do, and that is to uplift people from the levels of poverty and underemployment and unemployment by training people.

For example, 5 years ago, Boston received $50 million in job training money. I wish to make this point clear. We received $50.5 million in job training money. This year, in the fiscal year 1987 budget, Boston will get $5.2 million.

In our major newspapers, we have help wanted advertisements. The Boston Herald and the Boston Globe. My job, in a thriving, growing city, is to try to get people who are unemployed eligible for those kind of jobs and trained for those jobs. And for those people who are working, but are underemployed, to give them an opportunity to climb the economic ladder.

The point is that it costs us about $3,000 to train a person. That person could be, for example, a woman, who may be on AFDC, and receiving food stamps and other kind of governmental assistance programs. The Government is spending much more on keeping that person in poverty than it would if it gave us the money to train that person—that woman—for a job with the child care or day care programs and job training. And that person, in turn, would be paying back to the Government $3,200 in taxes, and would be off AFDC, off food stamps, and off Government assistance, and would feel much better about herself.

We are doing that. We are, in fact, doing that very clearly. The unemployment rate is remarkably low. It is a sure example of a successful governmental program that is uplifting people. It could not be any clearer. Yet, at the same time, the one program that we have to do that is the program that is being cut dramatically by the Federal Government. It absolutely makes no sense.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

The gentlelady from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mayor Flynn, I greatly appreciate your testimony today, and I want to commend you on your sincerity, purpose, and dedication.

You will remember, I rather dramatically in my opening statement referred to the fact that the discussion of these issues holds up a mirror to the face of society and that it is a rather ugly image. We do not like what we see. So, these are painful issues for us to discuss—I certainly find them painful.

You know, I do not disagree with anything that you have said, either on the relative spending of the Defense Department versus some very real needs, notably child nutrition. I also serve on the Education and Labor Committee and deal with the child nutrition programs. I agree with your position there.

I deal with the very intractable problem of housing and CDBG on my other committee. I have just got to say for the record that although we have built the most expensive housing in the world for needy, elderly, and handicapped people, we have still only touched a fraction of those who need housing. We have got to find another way to deliver housing because we cannot continue to support this extraordinarily expensive method of delivering public housing.

But, we agree that we have got to find new ways of doing this.

I would like you to help me sort out the Federal, State, and local responsibility here. Not the Food Stamp Program, I will leave that to Mr. Emerson, but in some of these other areas. And I say sort it out because it is not easy for us. By the way, I agree that either Mr. Miller did not know what he was talking about or was misunderstood in what he said because there is a Federal component.

I have given the lecture I am going to give now to my own State officials. New Jersey and Massachusetts happen to be two States that are enjoying tremendous economic recovery, and I believe your State, as New Jersey, has not only met its budget needs but has been able to expand its State programs because of expanding tax revenues.

We at the Federal level have this intractable, impossible, $200 billion budget deficit, and as much as we recognize there are certain Federal responsibilities here, I have got to say that the States of Massachusetts and New Jersey have got to shoulder some more responsibility. One of those particular areas of responsibility, it seems to me, is in the area of the homeless, particularly the question of the deinstitutionalizied homeless.

Now, from your experience, and I know it is vast and more grassroots than mine, I would like you to tell me what you think, the State of Massachusetts, the city of Boston, and other States and cities across the country, should be doing for those deinstitutionalized homeless rather than treating them in temporary settings, such as we are now doing.

Mr. FLYNN. Yes. And, it is an excellent point, really, that you make.

Long before I was involved in politics, I was a social worker and a probation officer, and I was in the legislature. I came into the legislature in Massachusetts when the raging issue was deinstitutionalization, in the late sixties and the early 1970's.

It was a program that basically was well intentioned, not warehousing people with very serious mental problems, and that part of it was executed well. The second part of it was not. That was implementing community-based programs for these people in their respective communities. They gave us the philosophy but they never gave us the program to implement it, and it is just about now, not only here, not only in Boston, in New York, but across our country—I spoke last week in Philadelphia on behalf of the National Conference on Homelessness. The same issue is down in Nashville.

What we have to do now is get back to the drawing board and do what should have been done 10 years ago, and that is to provide community-based settings and shelter—permanent shelter and permanent housing—for the mentally ill. The problem with that, however, and this is in a broader context on behalf of all the cities, is that a lot of cities are not in the same kind of financial situation that Boston is and Massachusetts.

And, with the demand for housing so severe and the Federal programs and assistance for that housing creation being eliminated, virtually—section 8 money and so forth—so what I am saying is——

Mrs. ROUKEMA. But,——

Mr. FLYNN. Go ahead.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Flynn, may I interrupt you?

Do you not see, however, that the primary leadership role, both in policy as well as financing, should be a State responsibility?

Mr. FLYNN. I think it is everybody's responsibility, Congresswoman. I really do. You have States that, in fact, have surpluses, States like New York and New Jersey and Massachusetts. I come down here and make our point clear, but I am also on the doorsteps of the statehouse in Massachusetts as well.

It is a cooperative effort. What I am saying is we are between a rock and a hard place here. I go up to the statehouse and they say these are Federal programs, you ought to be down in Washington, you ought to be talking to the Congress people and getting assistance from them, go down—Tip O'Neill is your Congressman. Go down and talk to Tip.

So, I go down and talk to Tip, and Tip says, well, you know, you come from the State that has the particularly high surplus. Why not go back to the statehouse, and I am saying here, I am the mayor of the city of Boston. I do not have any surplus, and I have tremendous social unmet needs.

We are the economic dynamo of the economy of Massachusetts. All our money goes out, and it does not come back, and we have the unmet social needs.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Flynn, Mr. Chairman, will you indulge me for a few more minutes? I know I am taking a lot of time here, but these——

Chairman LELAND. Fine.

Mrs. ROUKEMA [continuing]. Are very critical questions, and I seldom have an opportunity to deal with a mayor that has such unique experience. I want to ask another question.

Chairman LELAND. Without objection from our colleagues, the gentlelady is recognized for that extended time.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I face the same dilemma, the policy dilemma, that you are facing in your community regarding the subject of housing.

We have been dealing with the budgetary question on housing on our committee. One of the proposals is innovative and has possibilities—extraordinary possibilities in some areas, but limited possibilities in other areas.

Instead of relying so much on new building, which is extraordinarily expensive, we are experimenting with a voucher program. This involves giving the money to those families that are newly poor—those who have jobs which are lower paying than their previous job. Give them a voucher to find housing on their own—this proposal has a lot of flexibility and a lot of desirable aspects.

What do you do when the vacancy rate is so low as in some of the U.S. cities? Has your experience led you to believe that a voucher assistance program could be successful and helpful, while not solving all the housing problems, in solving the housing problems for a certain portion of your residents?

Mr. FLYNN. I understand your question, Congresswoman. I would say that it does not help us to expand the supply of housing, you see, and that is one of the—by and large, it is a fine concept. I think it would be very helpful, but, again, it does not really address the issue of expanding the supply of affordable housing.

COPY AVAILABLE

Congresswoman, the question was asked about what we do with the community development funds—Mr. Leland asked the question about what we do with CDBG money? We put part of it into a housing trust, a housing partnership that we have entered into with the banks.

We identify every abandoned building that the city owns or that is in tax arrears. We put CDBG money into it so that the house can then be given to a locally based community development organization so that they can put sweat equity into what was an abandoned house, an eyesore, for which taxes were not paid, people were waiting in line for housing. It is a perfect kind of program. It has been extraordinarily successful. Again, you know, we could eliminate, or deal very seriously with, the housing issue if we could attack the issue of abandoned housing—not only in Boston, but across the country. That would be the No. 1 program.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mayor Flynn, I especially appreciate that, and would like to know more about your program under CDBG.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. The gentlelady from California.

Mrs. BURTON. I also want to commend you on a very fine statement, Mayor Flynn.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you.

Mrs. BURTON. Have you seen the dumping in Boston of homeless by other jurisdictions and counties? We in San Francisco do have that kind of a situation, where other counties will, and I do not like to use the word, "dump", but that is the only way I can explain it.

They have people come to San Francisco, homeless, hungry, because they do not want to work on the program or do not have specific programs and just——

Mr. FLYNN. I am going to tell you, Congresswoman, there is a fellow here who is with me, came from Boston, a reporter from the Wall Street Journal, and we were talking on the plane last night. The question that you asked was the very issue that we were talking about. He is sitting in the room, and I am going to tell you what I told him.

Last Thanksgiving, I went around—my wife and kids and I went around—to all the shelters and the food kitchens in Boston. Around 8 o'clock in my car, I received a telephone call from my office emergency number, and it was a member of the clergy from a suburban community.

I called him back, and it was a very affluent suburban community, and the member of the clergy said, "Mr. Mayor, at our bus depot, we have two homeless men. They have not had anything to eat." This is Thanksgiving Day. "They have not had anything to eat, and we don't know what to do with them."

I was just thinking to myself, my God, here is one of the most affluent areas in all of the greater Boston. I called up my police and sent them up to this suburban community, not exactly legal, I might add. They are out of their jurisdiction. We will ask the media not to print that.

We brought them back to Boston, brought them down to a city-sponsored shelter, where they had dinner and where they found warm and safe housing accommodations.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Yes, indeed. Our study indicates that over 50 percent of the people who we categorize as homeless in Boston are people that are not originally from Boston. And, that is the case when talking with Mayor Washington and Mayor Young and Mayor Koch. The reason for it is obvious; we provide the services.

People are going to go to those communities where the services are being delivered. You basically do not see homeless people lying in doorsteps or in grates in affluent shopping markets outside of America's cities. They will come into our cities. Therefore, the burden is very heavy on our cities. San Francisco does an excellent job in terms of dealing with the homeless population, but, you know, I guess the issue is, could we all do more? Yes, indeed, we can all do more. There is no question about it.

But, for Mr. Miller to say that it is not the Federal responsibility is really missing the point entirely.

Mrs. BURTON. I have a very short question. Would you give some thought to some kind of Federal mandate, stating that whenever low-income housing is taken down and new housing is being built, that the same percentage of low-income housing that was torn down be rebuilt? This is a contentious and ongoing battle in San Francisco.

I think if it was federally mandated, it might help the low-income people who cannot afford the housing that we are now erecting.

Do you have a thought on that?

Mr. FLYNN. Well, no. I will tell you what we have done in Boston. I mean, I think it is a very—it is a creative kind of idea.

What we have done in Boston, is develop what I call parcel-to-parcel linkage. Commercial development in Boston per capita was the greatest of any city in the country, followed by San Francisco. You have the linkage proposal.

I was in the San Francisco city hall chamber when they adopted the linkage proposal. If you want to build a beautiful high-rise office building in this area, in a very lucrative development area of the city, and we have an area in the neighborhoods that have been run down and have been left behind in this economy, then you also may develop those, and you have to provide affordable housing.

For every square foot of commercial development that occurs in the downtown area, we are putting it into a housing trust for two purposes; to expand the supply of affordable housing and to train people for a job so that they can participate in those new jobs that are being created.

We have to do that because we no longer can rely on the Federal programs. We have to come up with these kind of creative programs. And you can also look at it from the standpoint of condominium conversion. I do not know what the situation is in San Francisco. I assume it is like what it is in Boston and New York. Because of high property values, you have people who are living in houses—Mrs. O'Malley and Mrs. Johnson, who have been paying $300 a month, who are on fixed income—and somebody comes in and purchases that three-decker that they have, converts it into condominiums, and sells it for $200,000. Where does the tenant go; she has lived there for 35 years.

BEST AVAILABLE

So you know, there are some regulations that you can put on that kind of conversion as well, but you are on the right track, really. I do not say that just to flatter you. You are on the right track in terms of saying you cannot just let the erosion of affordable housing take place. You have got to put something back in its place.

Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mayor, I want to tell you that I agree with your statement. The fact remains that the words "hunger and America" should not be allowed to exist together. I agree with that.

Let me suggest to you also that some of your rhetoric here about full missile silos and not full corn silos do not exactly hit the point. I have checked with the gentleman from Iowa here earlier and he tells me that the corn silos in Iowa are rather full, as I know they are in Missouri. According to the gentleman from North Dakota, they are rather full in North Dakota.

One of the problems that the farmers are having is that the silos are too full. I think maybe we need to work on finding the means, through the Commodity Distribution Program, of getting some of the food from our silos to our truly hungry, who are in need.

Let me suggest to you also that full missile silos are not all together the problem either. In these tight budgetary times around here, I have, in the various cities I visited with the Nutrition Subcommittee and in subcommittees on which I serve, had it suggested that we could do this and we could do that if we only built one less B-1 bomber. At the rate we have been going with those kind of suggestions, I would tell you that we would have not just a Federal deficit, we would have a deficit in B-1 bombers if we use that solution to every problem that we are trying to solve.

Let me say, and I do have a couple questions that I want to put to you just briefly, anyone who can establish eligibility for food stamps is entitled to it. The farm bill, through the initiative of the gentleman from California, Mr. Panetta, was able to get some clarification. He strengthened the proposition that the homeless should be eligible for food stamps. They have to establish eligibility, but there is no question about whether or not they should be available to people who are in need.

And, I would say, further, the gentleman from California and I had some disagreements over this. The gentleman from Texas and I did, too. I wanted to give the full COLA for food stamps, and we did. I did not support withholding the COLA as we were looking at the budgetary problems. You may recall that the argument over Social Security was not whether there was going to be COLA increase or an expansion, it was whether there was going to be a COLA increase or not. We decided that in the case of Social Security, yes, there would be a COLA increase.

The argument over food stamps was whether there was going to be a COLA plus expansion. We gave the COLA and we permitted, under the House bill, a $2 billion expansion over the life of the bill. In conference, that came down to a half billion; but in terms of what we authorized, we did increase and expand the Food Stamp Program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I might also say, because I think it is important, some rhetoric has been used this morning that I think is unfortunate. I think it is important to keep records straight, at least in terms of the debate that Congress is going to be engaging in here this year.

The object of most of the budget recommendations, as I understand them, that may affect some nutrition programs, are not to do anything at all that is going to harm the poorest of the poor, the neediest among us. It is perhaps to find savings in the program where savings can be found. Perhaps to take some people off who are among those qualifying at the higher end. It is not to do harm, in any way, according to my understanding, to the needs of the poorest of the poor.

We have got a tremendous budget debate about to begin, and I think that we can shift some of the priorities that the President has submitted to us. That is part of what the argument is about here and now in the Congress.

I do not know any Presidential budget that has ever been enacted as it was presented. The President has submitted his budget, now the House is trying to come up with one and the Senate will try to come up with one. We will try to agree among ourselves and we will then try to negotiate with the President.

The name of the game here is that we should legislate. We, the elected Representatives of the people, should have something to do with establishing priorities. We should legislate and we should not sequestrate. I hope that is what Congress will do this year because if we do that, we can then reorder some of these priorities and put more sensitivity into the program than if we allow an automatic sequestration to occur.

Those are my comments. Now, I wanted to ask you, this committee and our Nutrition Subcommittee is studying the concept of one-stop service delivery, making programs more accessible to those in need. That is, you know, we assume that if one is hungry, he may also need housing assistance, may need fuel assistance, may need transportation assistance, all of these different programs at the State and Federal level have different eligibility requirements and different standards.

I think we ought to perhaps try to bring them all under one umbrella. Chairman Panetta and Chairman Leland have agreed that these are areas that we should be exploring.

Do you believe that this kind of effort would allow the programs to better meet the needs of the homeless and the hungry if we fight to have uniform eligibility requirements, to have them go to one office when they are in need, seeking their assistance, rather than have them going to four or five different places? Do you think that idea has merit?

Mr. FLYNN. I am not sure about the one-stop service approach. I have not heard that concept before.

But, certainly, any effort to expedite and to centralize the myriad of programs that are out there, to put them under one roof or one umbrella, makes some sense, from the bureaucratic point of view.

I know, certainly, in the administration of a city, trying to find out what programs are, in fact, on the books and which ones the city could become eligible for, becomes a major chore.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Let me say, Congressman, that it may not be the intent of the President or the Congress to hurt the poor, but, in reality, because I got that letter yesterday from the Community Development block grant that we had to cut 30 percent—I can assure you, as you saw personally, that that money is used for poor people—I have to send out letters to the people and say I am sorry that while your needs are increasing, while there is a greater number of homeless people, greater number of hungry people, we have to cut the program that we have by 30 percent.

See, that is the reality of it, and it may not be the intent, but I have to deal with the reality, and, you know, I just remind everybody of that particular point because Community Development block grant money, if you look at it, and look at it in the book as to how it is used in other cities across the country, it is used for shelter, it is used for soup kitchens, it is used for health care, for poor people. I use it to deal with the issue of low birth weight babies. For the very first time, we saw women that were undernourished because of changes in regulation, they were not eligible for the WIC Program, for example.

Therefore, when they were delivering babies, the babies were being born at low birth weights. That is the reality of these cuts. Again, I am sure from a national point of view, the last thing the President and the Congress wants to do is to see more undernourished people, or poor, but that is the reality of what is happening.

Mr. EMERSON. Mayor, I am not quarreling with that. I would reemphasize, however, that I feel that Congress has an obligation to legislate these priorities and not let the automatic sequestering occur. I feel that Congress, as the elected representative of the people, have the responsibility to do the prioritizing. I come back to my point that I will be glad to hear if somebody can show me, but I do not know any Presidential budget that has ever been submitted that has been enacted as it was submitted.

It is a part of the separation of powers process that Congress is a part of the action here. So far we have not been a part of the action this year. I do not know why, but we have not been. It has been by choice. It is not that the mechanism is not there for us to legislate and to have something to do with some of these priorities.

I am concerned that under Gramm-Rudman, for which I voted and for which I do not make any apologies, that there is some effort to arrange all of the pain up front. We have very, very serious deficit problems.

Right now, 15 cents out of every dollar that comes into the Federal Government goes to service the interest on the national debt. If we wait until 1991 to try to start fixing that problem, it is going to be 41 cents out of every dollar. If you think the Federal Government is short on providing services now, wait until we start paying 41 cents out of every dollar on interest on the debt and we will be even shorter on services.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Congressman.

The Chair would now like to recognize the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Domestic Task Force of the Select Committee on Hunger as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations, and Nutrition of the Agriculture Committee.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. PANETTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mayor, it is always good to have you here. I do not really have very much to ask you because I agree with the comments that you presented us. The work that you have done with the mayors, I think, has been outstanding in presenting to the country the problem of both hunger and homelessness in our cities throughout this country.

It is a tragedy. It is something that I would hope we could address as a partnership really. Human needs problems are not problems that belong to the city or to the State or to the Nation, they belong to all of us, and we all have a responsibility to share in these areas, and I think the sooner we recognize that and stop playing the games of whether it belongs at the State and local level or whether it belongs at the Federal level and try to work together, to try to find solutions to these problems, the better off we will all be.

Let me just ask you one question. What is the—what is your feeling with regards to why this is happening today? We are aware of the problem. We have seen it. We have seen it in soup kitchens. We see it with regards to the homeless.

Why is it happening?

Mr. FLYNN. I think there are a few reasons. No. 1, is the extraordinary increase in housing costs that many cities are experiencing. San Francisco, New York, Orange County, Boston. I mentioned earlier, Congressman, that housing costs this past year in Boston increased 38 percent. In the last 2 years, 72 percent. Extraordinary.

At the same time, there is a Federal program for assistance for housing subsidies almost being eliminated. The issue of a new category of poor, that more people—America is, in fact, becoming a two-tiered society. One for the very wealthy and one for the very poor, and that more people who are in that middle area—middle to low—are falling below the poverty level because of such phenomena as high housing costs, or changes in regulations. Probably, as we are sitting here talking, regulations are being made, changes that make less people eligible for certain programs. Therefore, they have to pay more of their fixed income for the necessities of life.

So, those are the major, major reasons for the homeless—such things as the Congresswoman pointed out about the deinstitutionalization in her opening remarks. We had a chat about that programs, that it was well-intentioned by the States to take people from these institutions and put them out into the neighborhoods, into the main street, but that they were never given the money or the programs for a community-based program to deal with them.

So, all those things are changing right before our very eyes, and as a result of that, it is putting enormous pressures on average working families in our country who cannot afford the cost of housing.

Mr. PANETTA. So, really, to address the problem, you have got to really address it on three fronts then. You are going to have to, first of all, deal with the housing issue and whatever programs that are there or can be developed to address that problem.

The second is the area of nutrition, I take it, in terms of proper feeding programs. And, I take it the third would really be with re-

gards to dealing with the mentally ill in some kind of comprehensive way as well, right? I mean, those——

Mr. FLYNN. Right, Leon. And, another one is in the area of jobs as well. Boston's population, like a lot of other cities, is increasing. If you notice the population of cities is increasing. It is a group of upwardly mobile affluent, young professionals or a lot of new people coming into our country, and they need jobs and job training and programs that we have that Congress has provided, the Job Training Program that has been remarkably successful in uplifting people to give them opportunities so they become productive breadwinners.

Those are the programs that we are—that are being cut dramatically. So, I would say that those three plus the issue of jobs and job training, particularly for women, a lot of women. Look at the statistics and compare it with 10 years ago. A lot of women are the sole providers for their families, and we have got to provide training, and we have got to provide day care for them so that they are not totally dependent on government for their existence.

Mr. PANETTA. Thank you very much. Thank you for coming.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Panetta appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 142.]

Chairman LELAND. The gentleman from North Dakota. That is just north of South Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. That is correct.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me say, first, that the reference that you made, Mr. Mayor, to silos is something I understand. We have 300 Minuteman 3s in North Dakota and silos of Mark 12 warheads. So, I understand silos, and I respect the gentleman from Missouri, but I respectfully disagree with some of the statements he made this morning.

I, again, with great respect, say as one Member of Congress, I think the President's budget that he submitted is totally irresponsible. He is, in my judgment, avoiding responsibility of leadership by sending a budget to Congress that neither Republicans nor Democrats will vote for.

There seems to be an obsession and there has been for a couple of years around here that if it explodes, let us buy it and call it security. If it is investing in people, somehow it is liberal, and maybe that which is liberal is bad and wasteful. And, yet, I will tell you that I think we are overspending on defense at this year's level by probably $20 billion.

The evidence is so overwhelming that we are throwing money at defense and wasting enormous amounts of money that anybody who fails to see it in this Congress just is not looking very hard.

Now, the President says on top of that I want another 12 percent increase in defense. I want a 33-percent increase in the military assistance program in foreign aid. At the same time, he is saying dozens of programs that will and do affect the poorest of the poor in this country, you are going to have less money.

I think it was John Mitchell some years ago who said that "watch what we do, not what we say." So, I want to ask you again, because I think the point you made is very important, what will

happen to the funds that you receive for job training in your city as a result of these budget priorities?

And, the reason I ask this question is this, every one I have talked to at the shelter, every welfare person I have talked to at a Head Start Program, who was dropping their kids off, every one I have talked to who is in desperate trouble has almost had exactly the same message, they are not part of a conscious cycle of poverty entrapment in which they want to remain. They are part of a cycle of poverty from which they want to escape, and how do they want to escape, almost every single one I have had the chance to visit with, by God, wants a job.

How do they get a job? They need to get some training. I think training is the most important area of investment at this point, aside from the immediate day-to-day needs. What is going to happen with training? I think you testified earlier, when I was here and I listened incredulously to the kind of decrease in funds that you are talking about, can you give me an amplification on that?

Mr. FLYNN. You know, it is—I do not want to pretend to be the spokesperson for the Republican party because I am a good member of the Democratic party, but if you will look, as I understand Republican programs, you would think that this would be the ideal Republican program, in terms of training people so they would become productive citizens and productive breadwinners and have jobs.

This program is, in fact, successful. It worked. It works. And, what we have done is expand it so it is not just totally dependent on a partnership between the city and the Federal Government. We have expanded it so it is a partnership among the Federal Government, the city, and the private community.

I sit down with business people all the time and say what is the economy of our city. You can probably go back in a great society program or those other programs that provided training for jobs that may not be there.

What we do is identify where the jobs are and what types of jobs there are, and we train people so that when they complete that training program, they then are eligible for that particular program. But the Federal program has been cut, and we are still aggressive in developing this partnership with the private community. This will mean that there are less people eligible for the program, and that there are going to be more people on welfare and assistance.

For example, in Massachusetts, we had our Governor down here just last week, and the Governor was talking about the employment and training program. In a few short years, under that program, 23,000 people have been taken off of welfare, AFDC, and are now working. It is a successful program, and it works.

What I see happening here as well is the Summer Jobs Program money being cut dramatically. What is that? The WIN Program or something?

Ms. WAXMAN. The WIN Program and the ET Program.

Mr. FLYNN. The ET Program, that I just mentioned. These programs that are really working, Congressman, and I think it is—you know, you either pay now or you pay later. If you do not want to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

pay now to train people, to educate kids, to get people decent nutritional service, you pay for it later on. You pay for it in social upheaval. You pay for it in prisons. You pay for it in welfare, and that is the shortsightedness of what is happening now.

Certainly, everybody is concerned about the deficit, but, you know, it was not really the poor people of the cities that caused this deficit, and it should not be they alone that are asked to balance the budget and deal with the deficit.

Mr. DORGAN. Well, there are dozens of reasons for the Federal deficit, I guess. My particular feeling is that if you increase defense spending a $150 billion in 5 years and do not have the courage to say to people, look, we are going to make the case for needed additional security, we are going to make the case, we want you to buy it and we want to pay for it, fail to do, what you do is add a $150 billion in the spending side, do not provide the revenue and end up with a deficit. It does not take sophisticated arithmetic to get through that process.

But, what I was trying to point out is that John Mitchell stuff about what do we do as opposed to what we say. I do not think that James Miller is guilty of misquotes. I mean, I think he says—I think what he is talking about is the unvarnished truth with respect to Reaganomics.

We do not want to do much here at the Federal Government level, those who are saying that, you do it all back home, if you want to do it at all. What we want to do is provide for massive military buildups, cut back on most of these programs, and say to you, if you have got the resources, fine, but it is not our responsibility.

What I was saying earlier is that I think I agree with you, and I think most of us on the committee, Republicans and Democrats, probably agree. Investment in people by training represents the opportunity to escape from that cycle of poverty, and I tell you, those who go out and talk to people who are trapped in that cycle of poverty will discover that they are not the kind of people who are squirreling, as Mr. Buchanan and others suggest, in a circle from which they do not want to escape, they are people who almost, to a man and woman, want desperately to be able to improve their lives. How? By finding a good job.

How do they find a good job? By being able to get the training to be appointed, to be selected, to be recruited for that job, and I just think that we ought to rethink this whole process and what we are talking about is precisely selected priorities for this country's future.

What is a priority expenditure? Defense? Certainly. The need to defend ourselves. But, how much? When do we start wasting money? And, then, beyond that, what else is a priority for investment in this country? Not just individually but collectively and what saves us money?

I think the right investment in human welfare programs saves this country a great deal of money, in addition to allowing people to escape from that entrapment.

Mr. FLYNN. We have to have a strong military defense, Congressman, for our country, but we also have to have a strong country to defend.

Mr. DORGAN. Well, thank you very much.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you, Congressman. Sunday, my wife and kids and I are going to get in the car and we are going to drive out to the country and I want to take a good look at those silos. I have no idea what they look like. We do not see them in cities.

Chairman LELAND. You should do that. Mrs. Roukema and I were suggesting that, as implied by the gentleman from Missouri, that the silos are full, and what we need to do is figure out how we can transfer the abundance of food grains from the silos to the tables of people so that they can have enough food to eat.

Mr. Mayor, thank you very much for your participation here today.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. Have a good weekend.

Mr. FLYNN. Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. The Chair would now like to ask Mr. John Bode to please come forward. He is the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Over the last 5 years, Mr. Bode has had a major responsibility for the administration of the Food Stamp Program and the Food Distribution Program for charitable institutions.

The two major USDA programs providing food assistance to the homeless.

If you do not mind, please introduce the young lady who is with you.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN W. BODE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ACCOMPANIED BY CHRISTY SCHMIDT, OFFICE OF ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION**

Mr. BODE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would be pleased to. Accompanying me today is Christy Schmidt, who is with the Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Analysis and Evaluation.

Chairman LELAND. If you will, please summarize your statement. We have gone far into the morning and we have several other witnesses. We would hope that you would be able to summarize and will accept without objection the full text of your statement for the record.

Mr. BODE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was about to ask permission to do so.

Chairman LELAND. You are very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. BODE. I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today.

The Food and Nutrition Service, the largest agency that I am responsible for at USDA, administers a variety of food assistance programs, targeted primarily, though not exclusively, to persons with low incomes.

The list of programs is included in my testimony. The scope of the food program effort is quite large. The magnitude of the Federal food assistance effort is dramatized, I think, by the fiscal year 1985 record.

BEST AVAILABLE

During that year, about $20 million in food assistance was provided. Approximately 20 million people a month received food stamps valued at $10.7 billion. During the course of the year, approximately 35 million people were served by the Food Stamp Program.

Further, as a limited entitlement program, the Food Stamp Program provides benefits to all eligible applicants. Thus, the Food Stamp Program is responsive to changing economic conditions.

In fiscal year 1985, there were over 23 million average daily participants in the National School Lunch Program, subsidized at an annual cost of over $3 billion; average daily participation in the breakfast program was 3.4 million.

The School Lunch and Breakfast Programs are entitlement programs that increase in size if need increases. Every child from a household with an income below 130 percent of the poverty level in a participating school is eligible to receive a free school meal.

Last year, the WIC Program provided monthly benefits to approximately 3 million pregnant and post-partum women, infants and children, up to age 5, determined by a professional to be at nutritional risk. Federal funding for that program was approximately $1.5 billion.

About one-fourth of all U.S. babies under 1 year of age receive WIC Program benefits. Participation in WIC increased 50 percent, from 2.1 million to over 3 million persons per month during the period 1981 to 1985. Federal expenditures for WIC have more than doubled since 1980.

With respect to the homeless, of course, that is a very complex issue. First, it is unclear how many homeless persons there are. Estimates vary widely. In May 1984, the Department of Housing and Urban Development released a systematic national study of the homeless which concludes that nationwide there are probably 250 to 350,000 homeless persons. Second, homeless seem to be a mixed group, composed of various subgroups, including displaced families, the unemployed, the mentally ill, and alcohol and drug abusers.

Third, this population has diverse needs, including housing, counselling, employment, medical care as well as food. At present, the food needs of the homeless are addressed by numerous local public and private organizations as well as several Federal agencies.

Specific FNS programs which address the needs of the homeless, first of all, of course, is food stamps. Current food stamp regulations have been in effect since 1978, and I must express some frustration with Mayor Flynn's remarks about changes in the Food Stamp Program, especially as they relate to the homeless.

These regulations are the same regulations that have been in place since 1978. They contain no barriers to participation by homeless persons. Benefits cannot be denied because a household lacks a fixed residence. We have repeatedly gone to the States, with urging and very intense oversight, I might add, from Messrs. Panetta and Emerson and their subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee, addressing this question in detail. We have repeatedly gone to the States, and I have personally talked to Commissioner Atkins in Massachusetts about the matter to ensure that the the—homeless do have access to the Food Stamp Program.

While residency must be verified, applicants who lack written documentation may be approved on the basis of a collateral contact by someone who knows the applicant's circumstances. Cooking facilities are not required, despite some statements to the contrary.

Although the program was already serving the homeless, of course, Congress included a specific requirement in recent legislation, the farm bill, that State agencies provide a method of certifying and issuing coupons to eligible households that do not reside in permanent dwellings or have no fixed addresses.

We, of course, have been in contact with the States and are working on that matter. The Food Stamp Program continues to provide benefits quickly to the most needy. Applicant households with gross incomes of $150 per month or less as well as destitute migrant or seasonal farm workers with not more than $100 in liquid resources, are entitled to benefits within 5 calendar days if otherwise eligible.

USDA provides foods to State distributing agencies to help meet many of the nutritional needs of the needy, including the homeless. These programs improve the nutritional quality of the diets of the many people participating in USDA food programs. Two such food assistance programs which have provided assistance to the needy and homeless are the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program, TEFAP, as well as the Food Distribution Program for charitable institutions.

Under the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program, surplus commodities are provided free to needy persons through public and nonprofit organizations. We work through the States to accomplish this.

Eligible organizations include soup kitchens, food banks and service-type organizations as well as Salvation Army and Lions Club and other charitable private groups. Commodities being made available for distribution by State distributing agencies are nonfat dry milk, corn meal, flour, honey, cheese, rice, and butter.

Since 1981, when President Reagan started this program, with discretionary authority, over 3 billion dollars' worth of dairy and other surplus commodities have been provided. Surplus commodities are distributed also to schools and thousands of charitable institutions, providing meals to the needy. Charitable institutions, which serve the homeless, such as churches operating soup kitchens, orphanages, homes for the aged, receive a wide variety of surplus commodities to help provide meals to needy persons.

In fiscal year 1985, nearly 120 million dollars' worth of surplus commodities were provided. That is about twice the level as 3 years before.

I want to mention other agency involvement as Mrs. Roukema has referred to, to the Federal Task Force on the Homeless, which is chaired by the Department of Health and Human Services.

The task force began operation in November 1983. It is comprised of 15 Federal agencies, works with States and localities, both directly and through regional task forces, to inform them about USDA as well as other Federal resources available to communities in meeting emergency needs.

The task force, for example, has worked to ensure that communities know that the homeless may be eligible for entitlement pro-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

grams, such as food stamps and SSI, enabling many individuals to receive support on a continuing basis. In addition, a number of interagency agreements have been negotiated to provide support for food and shelter operations.

The General Services Administration donates surplus property and equipment and clothing to food banks and shelter projects. The property and equipment available include refrigerators, kitchen supplies, furniture, medical supplies, heaters, and similar items.

The Department of Defense also provides incidental support, such as cots and blankets, to shelters at no cost. The Department of Defense and the Coast Guard enter into agreements which include food banks with commissaries to obtain surplus food. Currently, 186 such agreements are in place. Donations are currently running at the rate of over 2 million pounds per year.

Defense also makes available military warehouse space to food banks for storage of the food. The National Guard has agreed to make its facilities and manpower services available within the mission of its training operation to support food and shelter operations.

They transport food, clothing, and other surplus property. They also have provided manpower services and allowed use of armories for storage. That has been done frequently, in particular with the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program.

GSA, Defense, HUD, and the Farmers Home Administration also make facilities and single family homes available for use as shelters.

In my prepared testimony, Mr. Chairman, there is also rather extensive remarks concerning some recent studies, in particular a study released by the Physicians Task Force on Hunger.

In summarizing, I believe my testimony is quite critical of that study and its methodology. I believe it was appropriate to include it so that information would be available for the committee.

In conclusion, the American taxpayers, I think, ought to be proud of our efforts to assist those in need. Clearly, every problem has not been solved. All personal hardship has certainly not been alleviated. However, we have an unprecedented Federal food assistance effort that generally addresses the food assistance needs of low-income Americans.

To it is added an impressive level of State and local food assistance from both governmental and charitable sources. With that augmentation, we have in this country an expansive food assistance effort. Though it has been improved in recent years, it certainly is not perfect.

We appreciate the invitation to present testimony today, and we would appreciate the opportunity to work with the committee to improve food assistance to those in need.

That concludes my formal remarks. I would be pleased to try to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Bode appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 145.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR JOHN BODE

### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MICKEY LELAND

*Question.* In your testimony you state that to participate in the Food Stamp Program homeless persons must have residence verified and those "applicants who lack written documentation may be approved on the basis of a collateral contract." Could you please clarify the specific requirements to verify residency of a homeless person?

Answer. According to the food stamp regulations the residency requirements shall be verified except in unusual cases—such as some migrant farmworker households or households newly arrived in a project area—where verification of residency cannot reasonably be accomplished. This could include most homeless persons. Verification of residency should be accomplished to the extent possible in conjunction with the verification of other information such as, but not limited to, identity. If verification cannot be accomplished in conjunction with the verification of other information, then the State agency shall use a collateral contact—not contract as stated in the question—or other readily available documentary evidence. Any document or collateral contact which reasonably establishes the applicant's residence must be accepted and no requirement for a specific type of verification may be imposed. No durational residency requirement shall be established. Benefits shall not be delayed beyond the delivery standards prescribed in the regulations solely because the household's residence has not been verified.

*Question.* During the hearing you mentioned that homeless persons living in "institutions" who have special needs can receive food stamps. Could you please provide any regulations and policy memorandums issued by the Department regarding this provision?

Answer. According to section 273.1(e) of the food stamp regulations, individuals shall be considered residents of an institution when the institution provides them with the majority of their meals—over 50 percent of three meals daily—as part of the institution's normal services and the institution has not been authorized to accept food stamps. Recently we issued a policy memo, index No. 86-10, in which we clarified that certain otherwise eligible persons living in a shelter which provides more than 50 percent of daily meals may be eligible for food stamps. If such persons are unable to eat the meals provided due to a verified need for a special diet which the shelter is unable or unwilling to provide, they may be eligible for food stamp benefits. Verification should be documentation from a physician or other qualified person of the applicant's special dietary needs and documentation from the shelter that the required diet is not being provided.

Copies are provided in accordance with your request

# FOOD STAMP PROGRAM POLICY MEMO

Region: ALRO
Index No: 86-10
Provision: 273.1(e)

MAR 3 1986

Subject: ELIGIBILITY OF SHELTER RESIDENTS UNABLE TO EAT PROVIDED MEALS

Question

Can a person living in a shelter which provides more than 50 percent of daily meals, but is unable to eat the provided meals due to a need for a special diet, be eligible for food stamp benefits?

Answer

Otherwise eligible persons residing in a shelter which provides more than 50 percent of daily meals may be eligible for benefits if they are unable to eat the meals provided due to a verified need for a special diet which the shelter is unable or unwilling to provide. Verification should be documentation from a physician or other qualified person of the applicant's special dietary needs and documentation from the shelter that the required diet is not being provided.

Virgil L. Conrad

VIRGIL L. CONRAD
Deputy Administrator
Family Nutrition Programs

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

273.1 (c) (5)

11-19-82

(3) of this section) shall be considered available to such household. However, the amount of the payment that a boarder gives to a household shall be treated as self-employment income to the household. The procedures for handling self-employment income from boarders (other than such income received by a household that owns and operates a commerical boarding house) are set forth in § 273.11(b). The procedures for handling income from boarders by a household that owns and operates a commerical boarding household are set forth in § 273.11(a). For Program purposes, a commerical boarding house is defined as an establishment licensed as an enterprise which offers meals and lodging for compensation. In project areas without licensing requirements, a commerical boarding house shall be defined as a commerical establishment which offers meals and lodging for compensation with the intent of making a profit. The number of boarders residing in a boarding house shall not be used to determine if a boarding house is a commerical enterprise.

10-17-78

(d) *Head of household.* State agencies may designate the head of household or permit the household to do so. State agencies shall not use the head of household classification to impose special requirements on the household, such as requiring that the head of household, rather than another responsible member of the household, appear at the certification office to make application for benefits.

4-23-82

(e) *Residents of institutions.* Individuals shall be considered residents of an institution when the institution provides them with the majority of their meals (over 50% of three meals daily) as part of the institution's normal services and the institution has not been authorized to accept coupons. Residents of institutions are not eligible for participation in the program with the following exceptions:

(1) Residents of federally subsidized housing for the elderly, built under either section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 or section 236 of the National Housing Act.

(2) Narcotic addicts or alcoholics who, for the purpose of regular participation in a drug or alcohol treatment and rehabilitation program, reside at a facility or treatment center.

(3) Disabled or blind individuals who are residents of group living arrangements (as defined in § 271.2) and who receive benefits under Title II or Title XVI of the Social Security Act.

(4) Women or women with their children temporarily residing in a shelter for battered women and children as defined in § 271.2. Such persons temporarily residing in shelters for battered women and children shall be considered individual household units for the purposes of applying for and participating in the Program.

10-17-78

4-4-80

12-8-81

10-17-78

(f) *Authorized representatives.* (1) The head of the household, spouse, or any other responsible member of the household may designate an authorized representative to act on behalf of the household in one or all of the following capacities:

(i) *Making application for the program.* When the head of the household or the spouse cannot make application, another household member may apply or an adult nonhousehold member may be designated as the authorized representative for that purpose. The head of the household or the spouse should prepare or review the application whenever possible, even though another household member or the authorized representative will actually be interviewed. In conjunction with these provisions, another household member, or the household's authorized representative, may complete work registration forms for those household members required to register for work. The State agency shall inform the household that the household will be held liable for any over issuance which results from erroneous information given by the au-

1-16-81

(4-23-82)

C-3

5-31-84

*Question.* In the regulations defining an institution for food stamp eligibility purposes, is there any language which clarifies the distinction between shelters where homeless persons reside for long periods versus those where residents leave each day and are not assured receipt of over 50 percent of their meals?

Answer. According to section 273.1(e) of the food stamp regulations, individuals shall be considered residents of an institution when the institution provides them with the majority of their meals—over 50 percent of three meals daily—as part of the institution's normal services and the institution has not been authorized to accept food stamps. If a shelter provides the majority of an individual's meals, but the individual is not in the shelter when one or more of the meals are available, he would still be considered a resident of an institution.

*Question.* What percentage or number of homeless persons eligible for food stamps and sleeping in temporary shelters not providing over 50 percent of meals are receiving food stamps benefits? If you do not have the above data currently available how could you make it available?

Answer. It is very difficult to estimate the number of homeless, as various public and private reports illustrate. The best available estimate is 250,000, as was determined by a recent study performed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The estimates range from 250,000 to as high as 2.2 million persons. Moreover, the Department does not collect data on individuals residing in shelters where less than half of their meals are provided for, who have applied and been certified to receive food stamps. A fixed address is not a requirement for eligibility. Therefore, State agencies are not required to collect such residency information. It is not currently feasible to collect such data.

*Question.* You state that there are 25 million persons who were eligible for food stamps in 1983 though there were 35 million persons whose incomes were at or below the poverty line. I am aware of your 1981 report to the Congress, entitled Assets of Low-Income Households: New Findings on Food Stamp Participants and Nonparticipants.

Do you have any more current data, based on the food stamp income eligibility guidelines which were lowered after 1981, to verify your claim that 10 million poor persons are not eligibile for food stamps? Please break down your response by reason and quantity how many poor persons are not eligible by each reason.

Answer. No more recent data is available. However, we are able to provide the break down you requested. Household composition, asset limits, and accounting period are three factors which must be adjusted in comparing the Census poverty line with the food stamp participation level. After these three factors are adjusted, we estimate that the Food Stamp Program reaches approximately 80 percent of all poor persons eligible for food stamps in an average month.

*Household composition.* The Census Bureau classified households as poor if the 1982 income of the people living together in March 1983 was less than the poverty line. Changes in household composition distort the poverty count. If, for example, a couple separated in January 1983, the income of the departed spouse was not counted in the March survey and the remaining family members could be mistakenly classified as poor in the previous year. Household composition changes can also work in the opposite direction. If changes in the household composition were reflected in the poverty estimate, the number of poor could be reduced by as much as 14 percent, or 5 million persons.

*Asset limits.* The Food Stamp Program imposes both income and asset tests to determine eligibility. Approximately 22 percent of the households—or 8 million persons—with monthly income below the poverty line are ineligible because of the asset limit.

*Accounting period.* The Census Bureau counts household as poor if their annual income is less than the poverty line. Food stamp eligibility is based on monthly income. The number of households with monthly income below the poverty line in an average month is about 7 percent higher—or 2.5 million more persons—than the annual Census estimate.

*Question.* How many of those with persons with gross incomes at or below 130 percent of poverty are eligible for food stamps but not receiving benefits?

Answer. The Department estimates that about two-thirds of all eligibles participate in the Food Stamp Program. Participation rates are even higher among households with low incomes. For example, about 80 percent of all eligible persons with incomes below poverty participate in the Food Stamp Program.

*Question.* What specific regulations or policy memorandums have you initiated to ensure the promulgation of section 1529 of Public Law 99-198, the Food Security Act of 1985, which requires State agencies to provide a method of certifying and issuing coupons to eligible homeless households. What is USDA's timetable for put-

COPY AVAILABLE

ting out the regulations on this statute and what will be the timetable for State implementation?

Answer. A rulemaking, amending two paragraphs of our current program regulations pertaining to residency, has been drafted and is currently under review. The changes are part of a regulatory package of nondiscretionary provisions mandated by the Food Security Act of 1985. The package is scheduled to be published in mid-May of this year.

Program policy has for some time specified that States may not require households to have a fixed address as a condition of eligibility. However, in response to congressional concern regarding the homeless, as expressed in the Food Security Act and its accompanying legislative history, our rulemaking will further clarify and emphasize that States may not require applicants to have a fixed address in order to be eligible for the program, nor may States deny a homeless household participation in the program when residency cannot be verified. Since these amendments to the regulations clarify and emphasize policy already in effect, rather than establish new policy, they are considered to be in effect and an implementation date is not provided in the rulemaking.

*Question.* What specific training or technical assistance have you and will you provide to States to ensure that eligible homeless persons receive food stamp benefits?

Answer. Our current policy, which prohibits States from requiring applicants to have a fixed address in order to be eligible for the program, has been in effect since 1978. States have had extensive experience with this policy and in certifying homeless households for food stamp benefits when they apply. Additionally, three separate, intensive efforts were undertaken by the Department in November 1983, February 1984, and December 1984 to emphasize to State and regional offices that the homeless were not to be denied program participation due to a lack of a fixed address. We, of course, will take immediate action to rectify any problems which may occur in this area, and we will continue to monitor this issue to ensure that significant difficulties do not arise in the future.

*Question.* Could you please describe any special local, State or regional projects that have been successful in increasing access to food stamps for the homeless?

Answer. We are aware of some special efforts by State agencies to help the homeless have better access to food stamp benefits but we are not aware of any evaluations being done to determine whether such efforts are successful. At least one State has arranged its certification manuals so that all procedures and requirements that affect the homeless are in one section so that no homeless person will be inadvertently denied. All States have verified that their manuals correctly interpret the food stamp regulations that prevent imposition of any durational residency requirement. Some States and localities have arranged special methods of issuance to make issuance to the homeless easier. For example, the city of Baltimore, MD has a special homeless unit that provides multiple services for the homeless, including acting as an address where food stamps can be picked up.

*Question.* Could you please provide the Select Committee with documentation to verify the displacement of cheese purchases in Minnesota as a result of TEFAP?

Answer. Information to estimate displacement on the State level does not exist. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the rate of displacement would differ among States. The Department's Economic Research Service (ERS) has advised me that there is displacement nationally. Their analysis is based on aggregate national cheese disappearance—a measure of commercial sales.

The committee should note that Minnesota's inability to meet the current demands of its TEFAP recipient population is a direct result of the State's liberal eligibility criteria. A household in Minnesota can receive TEFAP cheese if its income does not exceed 185 percent of the Federal poverty guidelines—in excess of $19,700 for a family of four. This standard is as generous as any in the Nation and more liberal than those in 41 States and the District of Columbia. Under such liberal standards needy households are forced to compete for TEFAP cheese with households that are relatively well-off.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

*Question.* What action does the Department take when it determines that the homeless are being denied food stamps because they do not have a fixed address?

Answer. Denying eligibility to homeless persons because they do not have a fixed address would place State agencies in direct violation of our program regulations. States found to be in violation of our regulations are subject to fiscal sanctions and judicial action under the provisions of the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

States are initially advised of their compliance with program regulations and are given an opportunity to correct deficiencies. If they fail to take corrective action in a timely manner, a formal warning of pending fiscal sanction is provided and a time period for taking corrective action established. If this period expires without the State completing action to bring the deficiency into compliance with program regulations, then the Food and Nutrition Service institutes action to withhold funds from the State until compliance is achieved. In the event this action fails to produce compliance with our regulations, the Secretary may contact the Attorney General to seek injunctive relief against the State while, at the same time, continuing to withhold funds. The Department has not uncovered any evidence of noncompliance with our regulations on the homeless which have necessitated our initiating corrective action with any State agency.

*Question.* Does USDA have any effort under way to assist the homeless who are eligible for food stamps but are not receiving them?

Answer. In reponse to our growing awareness of the need for food assistance for the homeless and the public concern for this, FNS has increased its monitoring of this matter. We have continued to re-emphasize through FNS regional offices and individual State agencies that eligible homeless persons are able to receive food stamp benefits. The current FNS policy is that:

Current Food Stamp Program regulations, in effect since 1978, contain no barriers to participation by homeless persons.

Benefits cannot be denied to a household because it lacks a fixed address.

Residence requirements are not permitted.

The following actions have been taken:

In response to the existing policy and concern that this policy was not being fully applied, FNS took steps to re-emphasize the application of the policy and to alert State agencies of our concern:

In November 1983, FNS directed States to make certain that otherwise eligible homeless persons were not being denied food stamps because they lacked a fixed address.

In February 1984, the directive was reemphasized.

In December 1984, the regional offices were instructed to initiate the strongest possible effort to ensure that States are stringently complying with program rules concerning the homeless.

In response, all 7 regions submitted letters confirming that all States are in compliance.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, DC, May 23, 1986.*

Hon. MICKEY LELAND,
*Chairman, Select Committee on Hunger,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I want to respond personally to one of your recent follow-up questions on my testimony before the Select Committee on Hunger on March 6, 1986. You asked for some additional information on how we arrived at the figures supporting my statement that the percentage of *poverty-level* Americans receiving food stamps rose from 43 percent in 1979 to 62 in 1983.

After a careful review of our backup material, it is now apparent that there was an inadvertent error in the testimony. The printed testimony should read "between 1978 and 1985, the percentage of *eligible* Americans receiving food stamps rose from 45 percent to 63 percent" (emphasis added). We employ numerous reviews of draft testimony by staff to avoid such errors. Regrettably, those procedures did not prevent this inaccuracy.

The error does not detract from the point I was making. A 1979 report which was based on 1978 data claimed that "hunger was almost ended." At the time of the report, participation among eligibles was significantly less than it is today. It seems counter-intuitive that hunger was almost ended when 43 percent of the eligibles participated, but is now growing when 63 percent of the eligibles are participating. Access to the Food Stamp Program is much broaded today.

Moreover, we have looked at data from a number of different sources to monitor trends in participation. There is simply no evidence in any of these data of significant change in participation rates since the elimination of the purchase requirement. Throughout the 1980's, all evidence suggests that participation rates have been relatively stable.

I hope this explanation is responsive to your question.
Sincerely.

JOHN W. BODE,
*Assistant Secretary for*
*Food and Consumer Services.*

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Let me ask a few questions, if I can.

We received reports from Boston and Houston that the homeless who sleep in shelters are routinely being considered residents of institutions and thus denied food stamp benefits.

What policy has the Department set on this issue? If there is no Federal policy, are regional offices making independent policies?

Mr. BODE. Mr. Chairman, we have checked repeatedly with individual regional offices to assure that not only the regional offices are not setting independent policy, but the States are well aware of the Federal policy.

The policy which has been in place since 1978, as I recall, provides that persons residing in institutions which provide over half of the meals are not eligible for food stamps. Those persons residing in shelters that provide less than 50 percent of the meals are eligible for food stamps.

We have recently sent out clarifying policy statements to States to make clear the cases where special medical needs of a resident of an institution that preclude them from eating the meals served in that institution are eligible since that would effectively bar their receipt of food at that institution.

Chairman LELAND. Have you found, however, any abuses of the regulations by the regional offices in some instances where they have refused to provide food stamps for those who are eligible in those institutions that have less than 50 percent of the food provided?

Mr. BODE. I am not aware of that, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to sit here and pretend to the committee that we are infallible. I think that we have repeatedly gone to our regions, and we intend to continue that effort, to go over in detail the availability of the Food Stamp Program for homeless persons and particularly in the institutional setting, and require them to work with the States to prevent any sort of a misapplication of the law.

I know that the House Agriculture Committee has made very clear their intention, and with respect to the review of the regulations, we did review regulations, but we did not enter a rulemaking on eligibility for the homeless. But it was done in a manner to assure, in an effort to assure that the homeless had access, have access to the Food Stamp Program.

Chairman LELAND. I am aware that Martha's Table, whose president is with us today, and the New York Department of Social Services have submitted requests for pilot food stamp projects. These pilot projects would allow homeless persons to purchase low cost hot meals at specific community dining facilities.

Why has the Department denied their request to conduct these pilot projects?

Mr. BODE. Sir, we have reservations about allowing food stamps to be used to purchase meals that otherwise are being provided free of charge to low-income persons and especially in cases where it is the homeless we are dealing with.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the Food Stamp Program, about 80 percent of the food stamp recipients receive less than the maximum allotment because they have other income available to them. Therefore, they are augmenting their food stamps with other income for making food purchases.

The only people that this provision would really affect would be the 20 percent of the food stamp households that have very little or no other income, and we feel that it is most appropriate that meals for those people continue to be provided without charge. That is preferable to the Department of Agriculture devising a new system for, and devoting resources to authorizing, educating, and monitoring these nonprofit soup kitchens.

Chairman LELAND. Have you advised Martha's Table as to how they might qualify for some assistance from you?

Mr. BODE. Yes, in fact, I had the pleasure of having lunch a couple of months ago with Professor Maz, and, of course, she is a very able person.

Institutions, such as Martha's Table, also have access to commodities in unlimited supply, as much of those commodities as they can use without waste. That is a direct form of Federal assistance that we have been providing, encouraging the use of. That is why the level of assistance provided through those means of commodities to charitable institutions has more than doubled over the last, I believe it was, 3 years.

Chairman LELAND. I have a couple of other questions, but I will come back to them after my colleagues have had an opportunity to ask their questions.

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir.

Chairman LELAND. The gentlelady from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Bode, I thank you very much. I apologize for mispronouncing your name.

Mr. BODE. That is quite all right.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be noted that Mr. Bode has rearranged his schedule this morning in order to appear here, and I want to express my appreciation to you. I know that it took some doing for you to be here and comply with our request.

Chairman LELAND. If the gentlelady will yield, the Chair would like to thank the gentleman for accommodating our interests in your appearance here today. Thank you very much.

Mr. BODE. Of course, sir.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Since I have my good friend and ranking member of the Hunger Committee Domestic Task Force here, Mr. Emerson, who is an expert on the subject of food stamps, I will not delay the committee's deliberations with many questions of my own on this issue.

I must say my mind is boggled by the question of food stamps and the homeless, especially regarding those who are kitchenless. I think it is important to consider, as Mr. Leland suggested, the possibility that the law be changed to provide some leeway in the use of these food stamps in other ways. However, understand the Department is limited because the issue is not clear cut.

I wonder if we could focus a little bit more on this at another time as these deliberations go on, and perhaps figure out some ac-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

commodations. I am thinking particularly of those families that Mayor Flynn has spoken of and that we all know about, the newly poor and the families similar to the ones members saw this morning during the site visit. I do not know what good food stamps do them if these families have no ability to utilize them without kitchen privileges.

This is the unsettling part of the problem to me. I do not pretend to have an answer, nor does anyone else here, but this issue certainly is one that can be explored.

I do not know whether I misunderstood the mayor, but he made some reference to using food stamps in restaurants. If he really meant commercial restaurants, I do not see how that would resolve the problem. That would be totally unsatisfactory.

Would you like to comment?

Mr. BODE. Mrs. Roukema, I would like to, first of all, say that I do not want to give the committee the impression that our mind is closed on this matter. We have been exploring the matter.

I am just not in a situation where we have some concrete action plan. I think it is best to express candidly the reservations that have held us up to date.

As far as restaurants are concerned, there are restaurants eligible to redeem food stamps for meals served to elderly persons. That is a situation that came on with a rather large move in the number of restaurants expressing interest and that was worked through.

What we found is very few people ever eat with food stamps at those restaurants, though those restaurants show signs and everything. Of course, eating in a restaurant is not a very economical way to meet one's nutritional needs.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I can see tremendous potential for abuse there, and I think that has to be thought through very carefully, whether it is for the elderly or for others.

Mr. Bode, I appreciate the fact that your mind is not closed, and I think that you have taken a prudent approach, and this issue needs to be discussed further to understand the full ramifications.

I thank you very much.

Mr. BODE. Thank you, ma'am.

Chairman LELAND. The gentlelady from California.

Mrs. BURTON. Mr. Bode, while the demand for emergency food has increased from 1984 to 1985, the total expenditures for USDA food donations to charitable institutions have declined by approximately 10 percent from fiscal year 1984 to fiscal year 1985. At the same time, the select committee staff has heard from several soup kitchens that they do not have access to surplus commodities from their States.

To what do you attribute this drop in Government donations?

Mr. BODE. Mrs. Burton, our policy and what we have told the States is that we will provide the commodities in as great a quantity as can be used by those institutions without waste.

In some States, the commodities are not in turn provided to those institutions or there are varying eligibility criteria set by the States for those institutions.

The level of commodity assistance overall for those institutions is up, though we did see that year-to-year decline you referred to. It is

AVAILABLE

our policy to encourage utilization of those commodities by those types of institutions.

So, basically, the requests that we receive through the States were down, and that is why less was provided through those channels.

The policy is one of providing as great a quantity of——

Mrs. BURTON. Seems unbelievable, however, where you have more hungry people that the request was down, is it not?

Mr. BODE. I am——

Mrs. BURTON. It is unusual.

Mr. BODE. Mrs. Burton, I think——

Mrs. BURTON. I am not doubting what you are saying, but I am saying it seems unbelievable——

Mr. BODE. Well, what I am trying to say, I do not mean to sound bureaucratic about it or evasive, we respond through that program by providing commodities to the States as the States request them, and those requests have been received and met.

The requests we receive from the States were down. There are different ways, of course, of measuring the number of hungry and the change in circumstance. I think one very good indicator is participation in the Food Stamp Program, which, of course, has been declining. That is, in large part, because of our improved economic situation.

Still, there are about 20 million people a month receiving food stamps.

Mrs. BURTON. Yet, we have more hungry people and homeless today than we had 20 years ago, right?

Mr. BODE. I——

Mrs. BURTON. And, by the way, a few years ago, the Congress, before I was here—my husband was here—the Congress did pass a bill to cash in food stamps for those who did not have kitchens. Under this measure, the elderly living in hotels without kitchens could use their food stamps in cafeterias and similar eating establishments.

So, in California, at the time, it was something that they wanted, and we ought to look in on this again. I do not know where it is today.

Mr. BODE. In California, the elderly——

Mrs. BURTON. Do we still have the program?

Mr. BODE. In California, the elderly do not receive food stamps, they receive cash in lieu of food stamps. That is true of Wisconsin as well as California.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. I would simply like to make a point——

Chairman LELAND. The gentlelady from New Jersey.

Mrs. ROUKEMA [continuing]. Aside from the potential for abuse, it would seem, on the surface, that you are correct, that it is an uneconomic way of delivering food. But what the alternative is I am not sure, and that is the point we have to try to work through together.

It is not an economical way to deliver food to the elderly or anyone else, and there is a lot of food for thought here.

Chairman LELAND. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. No questions at this time.

Chairman LELAND. The gentleman from California.

Mr. PANETTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bode, again, I appreciate your coming here and presenting your testimony with regards to this very crucial issue.

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PANETTA. And, I appreciate the testimony you have presented because you present a selection of programs that were designed to basically deal with this problem, and essentially what the administration is doing on programs like food stamps, school lunch, the WIC Program, TEFAP, and others, but I sometimes have the suspicion that your testimony takes place with two faces; one for the Hunger Committee, select committee, and the Nutrition Committee, and the other for OMB.

Because I look at the budget that the President has presented, and it takes every one of the programs that you talk about in terms of trying to provide relief for the hungry and the homeless, and it proposes reductions in those programs, and I have a difficult time trying to understand how you can both take credit for those programs and cut them at the same time.

For example, last year in the farm bill, we enacted on the House side and went through a conference, that provided for a number of changes in the Food Stamp Program to deal with problems that had been brought to our attention through our hearings and through the hunger commission itself.

The President signed that bill and, yet, every one of the additions that were included in that bill the President signed, the President now proposes eliminating. For example, he proposes eliminating the assets limit, right?

Mr. BODE. The administration proposes repealing the increase in the assets limit.

Mr. PANETTA. He proposes repealing the change in earned income deductions.

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir; we do.

Mr. PANETTA. And, you propose changing the day care center deductions. Repealing.

Mr. BODE. The separation of the deduction and the increase in the limit. That program expansion also we recommend for——

Mr. PANETTA. OK. Do not—let us not beat around the bush. You are basically seeking a repeal of what was included in the Food Security Act.

Mr. BODE. Those program expansions, yes, sir.

Mr. PANETTA. Even though the President signed the bill.

Mr. BODE. And, the President did note a number of problems with that bill, as you know as well as anyone, Congressman. I do not want to be presumptious, but that was a massive piece of legislation.

Mr. PANETTA. I do not recall him in his message saying that he was going to repeal these additions in the Food Stamp Program.

Mr. BODE. I am sure you recall that consistent testimony from the Department of Agriculture throughout that process, making clear the Department and the administration's opposition to those program expansions.

Mr. PANETTA. The President did not state it when he signed the bill.

Mr. BODE. The President, as I recall, noted three very general issues in his short statement accompanying that bill. There were other specific issues that he took exception to in the bill.

The proposal to repeal those program expansions that have not been implemented is very clear, has consistently been part of this administration's policy, and, of course, as part of our proposed budget changes. That is certainly the smaller part of our program changes that are recommended for the Food Assistance Program.

We do intend to cut back on the subsidies for meals served to middle- and upper-income families. In addition, we believe that strengthening the accountability of the Food Stamp Program in a manner very much similar to what was taken in legislation that I recall you were a sponsor of, H.R. 5151——

Mr. PANETTA. Let us take the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program. The TEFAP.

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PANETTA. You recommend eliminating the $50 million.

Mr. BODE. We recommend——

Mr. PANETTA. To support the administrative costs in that program.

Mr. BODE. That program started without administrative funding. It had worked at peak levels of distribution without that administrative funding. We feel that administrative funding is nonessential in this time of very tight budget constraints, and we feel that the distributions can continue without that provision of Federal assistance.

Mr. PANETTA. Well, there are a lot of people that disagree with you on that issue, and I think most people, generally, feel that if you do not have people in place to distribute the foods, the food is not going to be distributed. And, indeed, a number of States have told us that without that administrative funding, the program comes to an end. That is very clear. It is on the record. We have had testimony on that time and time again.

The cuts that you are proposing, again, in the programs involving school lunch, in the programs involving milk, Special Milk Program, I mean, these are all programs that have been recommended for reductions time and time and time again, and the Congress has refused them. The Congress has refused to do it, and, yet, you continue to recommend the reductions, and, at the same time, you then come here and take credit for the very programs that you are recommending for cuts.

Now, very frankly, I think it is time to end that kind of charade. You are either for them or you are against them. You cannot have it both ways, Mr. Bode.

Mr. BODE. Mr. Panetta, I guess it seems to me that in talking about the government assistance, in particular the Federal assistance, that is provided in addressing the needs of low-income persons in this country, it is appropriate to take note of what is being done.

The President has recommended over $18 billion in funding for food assistance programs, a total program effort of about $20 billion. In my view, these programs and food assistance, in general, is most appropriately addressed in terms of looking in detail at what is being proposed.

BEST AVAILABLE

You know, by the logic that I have heard, I understand you to urge me to take, if one proposes any change that would reduce the spending in a program, they are against the program all together. That is certainly not the approach we have taken.

Mr. PANETTA. No, no. That is not what I am saying. That is not what I am saying.

Mr. BODE. OK. Well, I——

Mr. PANETTA. When somebody comes before the Congress and recommends reductions every year in the same programs, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, one has to wonder just how much support the administration has for those programs.

Mr. BODE. Mr. Panetta, we certainly do not support continuing upper- and middle-income subsidies through the Child Nutrition Program. That is——

Mr. PANETTA. Well, how about food stamp benefits for the poor of the poorest?

Mr. BODE. We have recommended, basically, continuation of the present levels of activity in the Food Stamp Program. We did not recommend expansions of the Food Stamp Program, and we have recommended repealing the expansions of the Food Stamp Program that you referred to at the beginning of this questioning, and that has been a very consistent policy statement.

It does not indicate an opposition to the Food Stamp Program across the board, that we are against the Food Stamp Program as some, I think, might understand your comments to be.

Mr. PANETTA. Well, I find it very difficult to believe that there is strong support for the programs on a general basis when every year there is continued efforts to reduce either the benefits that are there or the benefits that the Congress and the President signed into effect.

I mean, you have got to, you have got to admit that one has to have a little bit of suspicion about just how strongly these programs are supported, particularly when, at the same time, you come before the Hunger Committees of the Congress and take credit for the very programs that are being proposed for reductions.

Very frankly, I have reached the end of the road on this issue. You have done that time and time and time again, and I think it comes to an end.

Look at the WIC Program. We have fought on the WIC Program alone. The whole issue of equity funds that are to be released for the WIC Program. Last year, OMB withheld $76 million for months, until the Congress brought pressure to release that.

Today, there are reports that the OMB has again ordered withholding those funds, some $10 billion, that are supposed to be distributed to the WIC Program. Now, can you assure us today that these funds are going to be released?

Mr. BODE. Of course, Mr. Panetta, what happened last year and the release of the funds this year are completely different matters.

As you know, there was a conditional appropriation last year. Those funds were not appropriated. The Congress authorized the release of those moneys conditioned upon the President's request. They were available upon the President's request.

Now, that is a completely matter——

Mr. PANETTA. The President——

Mr. BODE [continuing]. And that request came. It did not come as quickly as I know you would have liked it. This year, funding has been appropriated. The $10 million you have referred to, the only moneys that has not been allocated, as I recall, have not been allocated——

Mr. PANETTA. Will they be allocated?

Mr. BODE [continuing]. The WIC Program will be allocated on—I feel——

Mr. PANETTA. When——

Mr. BODE. I feel confident they will be put out next week.

Mr. PANETTA. All right. Well, I will be watching very closely.

Mr. BODE. I am sure you will, sir.

Mr. PANETTA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you.

Mr. Bode, you say that surplus food is available to States on request; is that not correct?

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir. The charitable institutions.

Chairman LELAND. We understand that you specifically denied Minnesota 8 million pounds of cheese from TEFAP. Can you explain that?

Mr. BODE. All right. Sir, the temporary emergency food assistance. There are, of course, several commodity distribution programs that we have underway. I was referring to, and have a couple of times now referred to, the commodity distribution for charitable institutions because that is the channel through which assistance is provided in large part to assist the homeless.

That is the means of providing much of the commodities used to serve food in community kitchens and various settings. The Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program is a different channel. We are providing about 35 million pounds of cheese a month through that program.

One provision of the authorizing legislation for that program specifies that the Secretary shall take such actions as he deems appropriate to prevent displacement of food with the distribution of other foods through the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program.

In light of that, what we were doing is, in addition to the 35 million pounds a month in process cheese that was distributed to, I think, every State in the country, we also told some States that, if they could process cheese that was in block form, we could provide more cheese because we had some of the cheese in large blocks which they could process.

Minnesota was one of the States that was able to take advantage of that offer. Now, they received, at peak times, 800,000 pounds per month because of the additional processing they were doing, and we were providing some funding for that.

The Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service notified us that as far as inventory management goes, they could not continue to provide that cheese in block form. We, therefore, discontinued that special facet of the program that provided additional amounts of cheese to several States above their regular allocations.

It was basically an inventory management reason that led us to discontinue that offer of cheese. We could, at this time, resume

that program because we do now once again have block cheese in stock. We have not done that because of the findings that there has been significant displacement resulting from the cheese distribution. Rather than make any reductions in the regular allocations in the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program, cheese allocations, we decided that the appropriate action would be to make no reductions, but, instead, not to reinstitute this facet of the program that caused some States to get a lot more cheese while other States went without. I realize it is a long story, but those are the facts surrounding that issue.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Mr. Bode.

You know, I just have somewhat of a conceptual problem. It seems to me that if a State was receiving 8 million pounds of cheese, that if they had that need, to stop sending that amount of cheese, would upset the State's needs tremendously.

Mr. BODE. Mr. Chairman, first, the State received 800,000 pounds a month at its peak, just to get the numbers straight.

Chairman LELAND. Well, however much it is——

Mr. BODE. The State of Minnesota, of course, like other States, has discretion in setting the eligibility criteria in the temporary emergency food assistance program. They have chosen to set some of the most liberal eligibility criteria in the country. It does not surprise me that they could distribute more of those surplus commodities.

Chairman LELAND. Well, what are the parameters that they have in terms of eligibility——

Mr. BODE. It is not——

Chairman LELAND. What do you mean by liberal?

Mr. BODE. As I recall, sir, it did not—it does not track with family size the way the eligibility criteria in many programs does. In Minnesota, they exceeded 185 percent of the poverty level for some household sizes, I believe. For other household sizes, it went as low as about 165 or 170 percent of the poverty level.

So, we were—for a family of four, that is approximately $20,000 a year.

Chairman LELAND. Just a second, Mr. Bode.

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir.

Chairman LELAND. I want to collect my thoughts here. [Pause.]

Let us go back for a minute, if we can. Are there policies administered by your Department that discriminate against providing food assistance to homeless low-income persons who are afforded shelter in any way, when it is available?

Mr. BODE. Are there policies that discriminate against low-income persons receiving food and shelter?

Chairman LELAND. Homeless persons who live temporarily in shelters, not providing the majority of meals on a routine basis for those persons.

Mr. BODE. Certainly not to my knowledge, sir. If there is some specific provision that you feel we should be addressing, I would appreciate knowing about it.

Chairman LELAND. I think you alluded to a response earlier in that you were suggesting, I believe, that food stamps are available to all homeless persons living in shelters.

Mr. BODE. I would be happy to address it again, sir.

Chairman LELAND. Without objection, we will hold the record open for a response to more specific questions on the accessibility of food stamps for the homeless.

Mr. BODE. Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. Mr. Bode, thank you very much for your participation and your contribution today.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask one further question?

Chairman LELAND. The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Bode, is not the question the chairman was asking, are you giving commodities to charitable institutions and, if so, how much can they get?

Mr. BODE. Sir, we are giving commodities to charitable institutions, and they can get as much of a designated list of commodities as they can use without waste. I would be pleased to provide for the record a list of the commodities as soon as Christy Schmidt can dig it out. It is a rather long list. They can get as much of these commodities that they can use without waste.

These were the commodities offered in 1985, and I do want to emphasize, we worked through the States on this matter. Macaroni, spaghetti, canned pork, cheese, butter, nonfat dry milk, honey, rice, corn meal, flour, peanuts, peanut butter, peanut granules, oats, vegetable oil, soybean oil, shortening, apricots, peaches, figs, prunes, and raisins.

Mr. EMERSON. Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. Mr. Bode, did you ever think about taking up auctioneering? That was pretty good.

Mr. BODE. I think Mr. Panetta got me wound up, sir.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you very much, Mr. Bode.

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir.

Chairman LELAND. Without objection, the gentleman from California, Mr. Panetta, has an opening statement that he would like to be entered into the record.

Mr. BODE. Mr. Leland, I want to be——

Chairman LELAND. Mr. Bode.

Mr. BODE [continuing]. Real clear. At times, there are limitations on what we have in stock on those commodities. That could—that would curtail the availability of those commodities to charitable institutions. I wanted to be clear on that point and not give the committee the wrong impression.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you for that clarification.

Mr. BODE. Yes, sir.

Chairman LELAND. The Chair recognizes that it is 5 minutes till 12. Several of our members have had to leave. We had hoped that we would have finished by 12 noon today.

The Chair, though he is hungry, and recognizes that probably his colleagues are hungry, too, his colleague from Missouri, and the Chair, however, realize the imposition that is rendered to those who have come from far and near by breaks and recesses that we might take.

Recognizing that, I think that the Chair will continue the hearing, even though the Chair might be the only person sitting here at the hearing. I appreciate the indulgence of the gentleman from Missouri and the extension of his time to be present.

Let me now invite Mr. Robert Hayes, who is counsel for the National Coalition for the Homeless. Mr. Hayes is a former Wall Street lawyer and now a national advocate for the homeless.

He has brought with him David Bright, a 10-year-old boy from New York City, who can tell us about his personal experience with being homeless.

Veronica Maz, has taught sociology at Georgetown University and is the founder and president of Martha's Table, a nonprofit organization that administers a mobile soup kitchen to the homeless and a stationary soup kitchen for homeless and destitute children in Northwest Washington, DC.

And, Ms. Margueretta Daily, a young mother of three children. Ms. Daily and her husband have survived to tell the story of 2 hard years after her husband lost his job when they were forced to join the ranks of the homeless. They now live at the Community of Hope in Washington, DC, a temporary second phase shelter where families live in apartments and receive comprehensive supportive services.

The Chair would like to thank all of you for coming forward today and we welcome your testimony and look forward to it.

Mr. Hayes, would you like to proceed?

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT HAYES, COUNSEL, NATIONAL COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS, ACCOMPANIED BY DAVID BRIGHT, A 10-YEAR-OLD HOMELESS BOY FROM NEW YORK CITY**

Mr. HAYES. I would like to start, Mr. Chairman, by introducing David Bright. David is one of New York City's more than 10,000 homeless children, and although it may not be clear from some of the testimony of the administration's witness, homelessness is becoming a disaster for this Nation's children.

Among the children, at one of the New York City emergency shelters where families are getting some kind of respite, there was a contest—an essay writing contest—to see who would be able to come down here and meet the committee. David, being one of the most articulate members of New York City's homeless children population, won. He came down this morning, and I would like to start the testimony with him.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hayes appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 158.]

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR ROBERT HAYES

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MICKEY LELAND

*Question*. From your position as counsel of the National Coalition for the homeless have you received reports that food stamps are being denied to homeless persons who are eligible for these benefits? If so, what is the extent of the problem and what are the specific reasons for such denial?

Answer. Yes, throughout the United States homeless people are routinely denied food stamps. In many areas, local officials mistakingly believe that homeless persons are simply not eligible. In other areas homeless people, by and large, cannot meet the various documentary demands to establish their eligibility.

*Question*. Do you have any recommendations for easing barriers to participation in the Food Stamp Program for homeless persons, in addition to those submitted in your testimony?

Answer. Obviously, a waiver of some of the more onerous documentary requirements for homeless persons would be helpful. Perhaps most important is a permit a de minimis proportion of food stamp funds to be used for outreach. It is not cost

effective, in the long run, to keep so many potentially eligible food stamp recipients off the rolls simply because they simply do not know about the program.

*Question.* Could you further explain why you have found that food stamps are needed to supplement the food assistance being provided by the private sector to homeless?

Answer. In recent years the private sector—typically religious and community groups—have responded generously to help meet the survival needs of many poor Americans. Unfortunately, that response has not been—and realistically will not be—commensurate with need. Few would argue with the proposition that the voluntary sector provides relief for needy people more efficiently and humanely than government. But, only isolated idealists argue that the voluntary sector's contributions can so much as dent the great need. Hence, there remains a desperate need for food stamps and other public nutrition associated programs.

*Question.* Veronica Maz, president of Martha's Table in Washington, DC, testified that she currently is not able to provide a nutritionally balanced hot meal for homeless persons despite the large volume of private and USDA food donations her organization receives. She recommends establishing a homeless food stamp pilot project which would allow the redemption of food stamps for meals served at her private nonprofit center. Would such a program benefit the homeless nationwide? Do you find that many private nonprofit agencies would be capable of meeting the accountability requirements that would accompany the redemption of food stamps for hot meals?

Answer. Many nonprofit agencies throughout the country would be able to expand their capacity for feeding people if food stamps could be used to supplement their budgets. I would recommend a much broader use of food stamps to permit homeless people, and others who lack cooking facilities, to buy prepared meals from nonprofit agencies and low-cost cafeterias and restaurants.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

*Question.* Does your organization, or the groups you work with, assist homeless persons so that they can receive the benefits to which they are entitled? The bureaucratic maze is difficult under any circumstances, but I believe that it must be more trying for the homeless who have very special needs.

Answer. (Part 1) Yes.

(Part 2) You are correct.

*Question.* I was struck by David Bright's testimony. In it he stated that many homeless children do not attend school because there is no room for them. This certainly does not seem right. Are you doing anything to rectify this situation?

He also states that if the bus comes late, and the children arrive at school late, they receive no breakfast. Can't you or people in your group implore the schools to change this situation?

Answer. (Part 1) Since Master Bright's testimony received such wide publicity, the mayor of the city of New York has moved to assist at least some homeless children get into school.

(Part 2) Again, after the widespread publicity of Master Bright's testimony, city officials said they would attempt to hold breakfast if children are tardy because the school bus is late. We continue to emplore the schools to make the buses run on time.

*Question.* We are studying the issue of program coordination and simplification—the so-called one-stop concept. Do you believe that less bureaucratic hoops will help the homeless population to receive the benefits to which they are entitled?

Answer. Yes.

*Question.* One of your recommendations calls for making pre-release application procedures available. Could you please explain this?

Answer. When disabled people are being prepared for discharge from a hospital or other institution certain steps should be taken so they will be able to meet their basic needs at the time of discharge. Food stamps should be available for these people on the day they leave the institution since—like the rest of us—they need to eat every day. This type of predischarge certification for food stamps should be mandated.

## STATEMENT OF DAVID BRIGHT, A 10-YEAR-OLD HOMELESS BOY FROM NEW YORK CITY

Master BRIGHT. Hello. My name is David Bright. I am 10 years old. I am homeless. I am often hungry. Right now, I live in the

Martinique Hotel. The Martinique is a mad house. The hallways are dangerous. Many things could happen to you while you are in the hallways.

The roaches and rats are a big problem, too. I am often hungry because I do not get enough to eat. Homeless kids are taken to schools far away. When the bus comes late, I cannot even get breakfast at school. When I arrive, the bell rings, then the breakfast just stops. I just cannot think in school when I am hungry. My mind just stops thinking and this cannot go on forever.

That is because I want to learn. I want to get a good education. Learning is fun for me. There are too many little kids in the hotel who never go to school. There just is not enough room in the school for them. Just like there are not enough homes for poor children and not enough food.

When I grow up, I will be the President of the United States. When I am President, every American will have a home. Every American will have something to eat everyday. Everyone in America will have a little money in his pocket.

When I am President, no 10-year-old boy like me will have to put his head down on the desk at school because it hurts to be hungry.

[The prepared statement of Master Bright and other homeless children from New York City appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 212.]

Mr. HAYES. Thank you.

Among my roles, I am the campaign manager for Mr. Bright's candidacy.

Chairman LELAND. Well, we might just change the Constitution and allow for him to run right now. I am not going to ask him what party he is in, but, hopefully, the Democrats and, hopefully, he will run for the nomination.

Mr. HAYES. With due respect, Mr. Chairman, I think we have found the neglect of these kids to be somewhat bipartisan. So, David's party may yet to be found.

The National Coalition for the Homeless will submit its prepared testimony. I would like very briefly, in a couple of minutes, to comment on a theme that has been going through here this morning, and one that we are quite familiar with around the country.

That is the theme of governmental buck-passing. Incidentally, there are two varieties noted today. Of course, the debate among the Federal Government and the State governments and the city governments, the local governments, all of which have officials that say this is a disgrace, feed the kids, house the homeless, but anybody but me. So, Washington looks to the States, the States look to Washington, the local governments look to the statehouses, and to the Congress, and everyone is finger-pointing and the kids are going hungry.

The other kind of buck-passing noted this morning is more of a regional issue. During the colloquy between the Representative from California and Mayor Flynn, we heard reference to the transient nature of the country's homeless.

We have identified now 50 different Governors, mayors, or county executives, each of whom claim they govern the Nation's mecca for the homeless because of their generous welfare policy and shelter policy for poor people.

Homeless folks are not running from city to city to enjoy the scanty shelters available. Mayor Flynn referred to 50 percent of Boston's homeless as not being originally from Boston. I suspect the same proportion would hold up for the mayor's cabinet. Most folks that are homeless are so poor that they have nowhere to go, but to look to their home towns and home cities for help.

Specifically, there are things that can be done. When words like intractable are used about hunger and homelessness, I throw my hands up because relief is not intractable. There is a fairly cohesive effort now being undertaken by the National Coalition for the Homeless, in conjunction with over 10 other national organizations, to propose to the Congress the Homeless Persons Survival Act of 1986.

The outlines of that, with the Chair's permission, we would submit for the record. It is a comprehensive act, based on the principle that homelessness is a national problem, which requires a comprehensive Federal effort by our National Government.

Homeless people do need shelter and they do need food. And hungry people, of course, need food, but they need housing. And people on the verge of homelessness, and kids who go hungry not every day of the month but a couple days of the month, need assistance too.

This Homeless Persons Survival Act will propose to amend a number of existing programs because the framework is there. It is not necessary to start writing anew, but it is necessary to begin dealing concretely, specifically and realistically to spend some money, and I hate to say that in 1986, to feed the kids and to shelter the kids.

With regard to nutrition, almost all these points have come up already. So, I will not go through them. This bill, though, will, and this is with particular respect to the committee, ask the Congress to stop the current prohibition on States using food stamp funds to get people signed up in the program.

The bill will ask the Congress to permit the use of food stamps for homeless people to go buy prepared meals. I cannot tell you of every homeless person, who, through great luck, has managed to get food stamps—and not very many can go through the bureacratic hurdles. They get a raw chicken and try to cook a raw chicken in a garbage can fire.

Even though the President's people keep saying that you do not need a permanent address for food stamp benefits, in almost every State of the Union, that is a de facto situation. We ask the Congress to make explicit that a permanent address is not required.

Two more elements. One, that you get money so that the States can, in fact, distribute this food which is now being lost in warehouses around the country, rotting away because States cannot get the food and the money through the administrative cost to get the food to hungry folks.

And, last, it is not known why the administration is not moved, why the Congress does not move to permit people about to leave institutions to sign up for food stamps, so they do not go through their first couple of weeks in the community homeless and hungry and then subsequently decompensate, get sicker, wind up back in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the hospital with great human suffering as well as great public expense.

So, we will be giving this bill to as many folks as possible. It is not going to pass in this session, but if the Congress finally recognizes that the American people think kids like David should have enough to eat, I expect it to get a serious reception.

Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you very much, Mr. Hayes.

Professor Maz.

**STATEMENT OF VERONICA MAZ, PRESIDENT, MARTHA'S TABLE**

Ms. MAZ. Mr. Chairman and committee members, I appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of the homeless. For the past 15 years, I have been working with the homeless in founding organizations like SOME—So Others Might Eat, the House of Ruth for Homeless Women, and Martha's Table for inner city children. Martha's Table has a soup kitchen and operates a mobile food service called McKenna's Wagon, which distributes food to homeless street people, and the National Institutes for Neighborhood Self-Help, which seeks solutions to hunger and homelessness. During these 15 years, working with the homeless, I have learned that there are solutions to hunger and to homelessness.

If you are homeless today, a street person, you can always find something to eat. You can go to shelters. You can go to soup kitchens. You can go to garbage cans. You can go to dumpsters. But—and there have been studies of this—for nutrition, the best meals served in soup kitchens are mostly starch. There is a great preponderance of macaroni and cheese, beans, rice, different types of foods that are donated by the Government, and by no means are they nutritional meals.

But nutritional meals are available if you use the present resources, and the present resource I am thinking about is food stamps. Different speakers have noted food stamps are available to the homeless, and the homeless may use the shelter as their permanent address to receive food stamps.

But once you do receive the food stamps and are homeless, what do you do with them? You cannot cook. You do not carry a refrigerator on your back. You do not have a shelf and place to store food. You do not even have cooking utensils. So, this particular group which needs food stamps more than any other is not making use of them.

Therefore, we would propose an amendment to the Food Stamp Act to allow the homeless to use their food stamps to purchase low cost hot meals prepared by nonprofit organizations. In the case of Martha's Table, we have referred to this concept as a food stamp restaurant. The amendment would thus allow an exception for the homeless to the general policy of food stamp use only for nonprepared meals.

The food stamp restaurant concept, which is proposed, would be limited to nonprofit organizations providing hot meals only to the homeless. The homeless participants would be identified by their food stamp I.D. cards. These I.D. cards have the shelter address

where individuals receive their cards since they have no permanent address. In this way, only the homeless will be served.

The food stamp restaurant concept would be developed in a manner consistent with the nonprofit philosophy of the overall Food Stamp Program. This would be ensured by incorporating certain restrictions as to who may qualify as a food stamp restaurant and the practices of those restaurants. First, only nonprofit organizations could apply to participate as a food stamp restaurant; this would exclude all commercial restaurants. Second, the food stamps used by the homeless to purchase a hot and nutritious meal could only be redeemed by the program operator for food products through food wholesalers or at a supermarket. No case transactions would be made. The stamps would be used to purchase vegetables, fruits, meats, and fish. Other commodities would be donated by the community. Third, the cost of a meal would be nominal, approximately $1 in food stamps. Fourth, no USDA food would be used or sold. All costs of preparation, program administration, and other services would be absorbed by the nonprofit contractor through contributions and volunteer assistance. In keeping with the policy of the Food Stamp Act, food stamps would be used only for the purpose of bulk foods.

Great interest in this proposed use of the Food Stamp Program exists throughout the Nation. At a Conference held on October 3, 4, 1985, in the Dirksen Building by the National Institute for Neighborhood Self-Help, representatives from 17 States expressed an interest in this approach.

Let me just very briefly mention some of the benefits of the program. First, it would go a long way toward meeting the nutritional needs of the homeless. Second, it would enable nonprofit organizations to meet those needs in an atmosphere that is respectful of the human dignity of homeless persons. Homelessness does not abrogate the individual's right to be treated with human dignity. Third, the concept of the food stamp restaurant promotes a cooperative relationship between the private and the public sectors. Fourth, the proposed amendment is not intended to increase the cost to the Federal Government since the homeless already receive food stamps. Instead, it provides for a more effective use of those resources.

Rather than forcing individuals to sell their food stamps for a fraction of face value on the black market in order to obtain cash with which to purchase prepared meals—and perhaps cigarettes and drinks—the food stamp restaurant would provide a dollar-for-dollar return and enhance the efforts of legitimate nonprofit organizations. Fifth, the availability of meals at a food stamp restaurant might indirectly facilitate solving the problem of homelessness, itself. Many nonprofit groups have told me they might provide housing or shelter if they did not have to be concerned about the additional cost of providing meals for the homeless. And sixth, the food stamp restaurant could indirectly affect the employability of the individuals by becoming a place where prospective employers and employment programs could make contact with those in ned of jobs.

We realize that according to the Food Stamp Act, food stamps to be used are to purchase food for home consumption, from retail

food stores, and may not be used to purchase hot food or hot food products. But there have been exceptions to this prohibition.

For example, the elderly and disabled are permitted to use food stamps for Meals on Wheels. These are hot foods. Also, senior citizens who receive SSI can use their food stamps for hot meals at designated senior citizens centers.

In further support of our position, I would like to submit for inclusion in the record, with your permission a lengthy legal memorandum on the issue of using food stamps for cooked meals for the homeless. This was prepared for us by the law firm of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld. The memorandum explores the legislative history, origins and reforms made in the Food Stamp Act as well as case law, and it notes this trend toward increased prepared meal use of food stamps.

Chairman LELAND. Without objection, the legal memorandum will be included in the record.

Ms. MAZ. Thank you.

We have learned from our legal study and of our study for the past 5 years that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to permit a demonstration project. We are therefore urging the committee to request the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a demonstration project. In 1984, Martha's Table did submit a demonstration project proposal to the Agriculture Department, but it was rejected.

We also would urge the committee to propose an amendment to change the act to allow the homeless to use their food stamps to purchase low-cost hot meals prepared by nonprofit organizations. If this is not feasible, we would request that you encourage the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a pilot project.

In conclusion, the problem of homelessness is real, and we can no longer afford to deny its reality. Resources, to respond on a longer term basis, are available, through existing programs and the private sector is willing to do its share. We are asking you to provide the means through which the private and public sector can cooperate, deal with this problem effectively.

Thank you for allowing me to appear. If I can be of any assistance in helping you to evaluate any matters affecting the homeless, please contact me.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Maz appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 213.]

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR VERONICA MAZ

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY HON. MICKEY LELAND

*Question.* I look forward to working with you on the establishment of a pilot project for a food stamp restaurant at Martha's Table. How many other organizations are you aware of that could benefit from such a program and provide tight accountability if the pilot programs were expanded at some future date? Please cite the specific organizations if possible.

Answer. Martha's Table has been discussing the food stamp restaurant concept for more than 4 years.

For example, in 1983, when the National Institute for Neighborhood Self-Help held mini conferences in 40 cities in the Nation (How to Start a Soup Kitchen or Shelter Without Any Money), the food stamp restaurant was always the workshop that generated the greatest interest.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As a result, representatives from 27 States have continued their contact with the Institute and their interest in the future food stamp restaurant.

Any nonprofit organization that has a creditable food service for the poor could benefit from the food stamp restaurant.

Providing tight accountability is an unknown factor. One of the major functions of the proposed model food stamp program is to develop the structure for accountability. Much of this will be determined by the eligibility requirements developed to select participants in the food stamp restaurant followed by the structure of the accounting and reporting system to be followed daily.

Based on the first year model program experience, the food stamp program should be expanded to six or eight other regions in order to test the system of accountability devised.

Fraud and abuse could be prevented by developing guidelines or standards for food stamp restaurants to follow based on the experience with the pilot project at Martha's Table.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

*Question.* Have you noticed an increase in the numbers of children coming to eat? If so, to what do you attribute this?

Answer. The number of children coming to eat is increasing for several reasons:

*Reputation.*—Martha's Table operates the only walk-in soup kitchen for children in the area. We have been at the same location in the inner city for 5 years. Throughout the years our reputation for services and nutritious food has spread throughout the District of Columbia. Many times mothers who have moved out of the area return with their children because they know that their children will receive a nutritious meal. Staffs of service agencies refer children to Martha's Table.

The numbers are definitely increasing and will continue to increase unless some change in behavior is introduced.

To break this cycle and to end hunger/poverty, Martha's Table has initiated an innovative approach. The approach is economic not social.

For example, each child coming to Martha's Table is gradually introduced to work habits: how to earn money; business techniques. These ideas are incorporated into a new program, the Junior Business Kids Program. For example, children who come to Martha's Table must pay 2 cents or bring an aluminum can to pay for the food. In addition, the children are involved in a formal business course.

*Immigration.*—The population of the Adams Morgan-Mt. Pleasant area has changed during the past 3 years. There has been an influx of Spanish speaking and other non-English speaking immigrants with large families. Most of these families fall below the poverty line. Hunger is a way of life. These children come to Martha's Table thus increasing the statistics.

*Housing.*—The area where Martha's Table is located consists of low- or no-income status—apartment and room type tenements, plus the District shelter for homeless families (Pitts Motel). Several generations will crowd into one apartment.

There is no place for poor families to move because of the shortage of affordable housing. Thus, each young mother, plus child/children, moves in with mother-grandmother and these children see only the standards of this family, and the cycle of eviction, poverty, and hunger is repeated. Children from each crowded apartment come to Martha's Table.

*Question.* Do you receive any Federal money for your program?

Answer. Martha's Table receives no Federal funding.

*Question.* Do you receive any USDA commodities? If so are they useful?

Answer. Martha's Table receives U.S.D.A. commodities on a regular basis.

The USDA commodities are very important for our survival. Martha's Table receives cheese, peanut butter, pork (canned) which are used daily for the 1,800 plus sandwiches which are distributed to the children, and street people via McKenna's Wagon, a mobile soup kitchen. In addition, the USDA provides other basic foods which are vital for nutritious meals.

The USDA local District office has been very sensitive to our needs and very cooperative. They maintain a good relationship with Martha's Table, continuously checking on our inventory and needs. They have kept us well supplied.

It would be difficult to survive without the support of the USDA commodity program.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you very much.

COPY AVAILABLE

The Chair acknowledges that there is a vote in process right now. I am going to suspend the hearing until such time as we can get——

Mr. EMERSON. If the chairman would hold for just 1 minute, I have an appointment at 12:30, and I am probably not going to be back before 1 o'clock. We have to go vote and I may not get back.

I just want to say to the witnesses here at the table that have had the opportunity to testify, I think it has been very outstanding testimony. Yours were commonsense statements. I would like to be able to work with you in trying to establish the pilot project which you seek.

I would really like to be able to work to try to get that pilot project going. Mr. Hayes, I am very glad you could be here. I would like, if possible, Mr. Chairman, to have the record open so that I might be able to submit some questions in writing about David's particular problems. I think we need to know what kind of help he is getting, what it amounts to, how it might be better administered, and what some alternative needs are for David and others like him.

Chairman LELAND. Without objection.

If the witnesses would just suspend, we will be right back.

[Recess.]

Chairman LELAND. The hearing will resume now.

We would like to now hear from Ms. Daily.

Ms. DAILY. Yes.

Chairman LELAND. Ms. Daily.

## STATEMENT OF MARGUERETTA DAILY, A YOUNG MOTHER OF THREE

Ms. DAILY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, my name is Margueretta Daily, and I am presently living in the shelter, Community of Hope, and I am here to testify on behalf of many of the homeless people, myself being homeless, and maybe to share some of my experience and, hopefully, in return, it will enable to bring about a change for the homeless people.

My husband became disabled in 1982, which caused us to have to get on welfare and receive food stamps, and for a period of maybe 3 or 4 years, when we lived in Portsmouth, VA, we had to go through a long suffering and depression, which made a setback on my husband by him not being—no longer the head of the household.

He suffered a depression and had to go to Portsmouth Psychiatric Institute for some time, and me, myself, I went through what you might call a depression as well because I was not able to handle most of the problems that came about which usually I was used to my husband dealing with.

But I did continue to raise my children, find some type of housing, which kept us on the move constantly, going from one house to the other, but Virginia did not have any type of shelter program for the homeless people. Most of the housing was sky high, but we did find something to live in.

But, as a result of going through a lot of changes and moving about and suffering, we did decide to leave there and we moved to Washington, DC, a year ago in October. From the time that we

moved here, we moved into the shelter, which they sent us to a location at Capitol City Inn on New York Avenue, and this is just a hotel where it was five of us. I have five people in my family, and there was only two bedrooms, but we did have somewhere to live.

We had running water and, you know, just a place to keep warm. This was really important to me because in the past, we did not have anything. It was a time that we had lived in a house and did not even have running water or heating system of any type. Just did not have anywhere else to go. We just stayed there because we did not have anywhere else to go.

And, by us moving into the shelter and after several months, we moved to the Pitt shelter that is located on Belmont, where they did, of course, give you meals and the same type of housing setting which was in a hotel room, but, still, I was not upset about this fact because I did have somewhere to go, as I said, and a place for my children to lay their heads.

And, after about a month or so, we moved from there and moved to Community of Hope, which is a shelter program, but the difference in this place is it is set up like an apartment. I have a place to cook, you know. I have heating. I have separate bedrooms for my children, and, of course, the rent is much lower to pay than regular housing, and we moved here in April of last year, which they only give you a 90-day period of time to stay there, but because of us not being able to find decent housing, adequate housing with enough room for my children and being able to pay adequate amount of rent that we could afford, because of us still having—needing—using welfare, then we had to—they gave us an extended period of time to stay in the shelter, which we are now presently living in.

But, since that time, my husband has received his disability, which still puts us in a bracket of about the same as if we were getting welfare and food stamps together, which we are still, you know, probably in need of for finding suitable housing that we can afford with our income.

But, I must say that with the help of a lot of the government agencies and the different programs they have, it enabled us to become a family again, and for my husband to feel good about himself to be head of the household, and presently, now, I am in a training program and I am training to be a medical transcriptionist.

When my—my term will be out in May, and I do expect to find suitable housing for us because by then my income would change. I will be working, and my husband will be getting his disability, and like I said, again, with the help of these different agencies, we could not have done it without their support.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you, Ms. Daily. Thank you very much for a very eloquent testimony.

Ms. DAILY. Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. Let me go back, if I can, to Mr. Hayes, and ask him a few questions, and I want to thank him for bringing David.

David was very articulate and we really appreciate him coming, and, hopefully, some day, he will get the opportunity to be President of the United States. All that he said makes a great deal of sense to me.

Based on your experience, Mr. Hayes, what role should the Federal Government assume in serving the needs of the homeless? Now, you alluded to some of the things more generally, but can you be more specific relative to the local and private sectors?

Mr. HAYES. Yes. For starters, you cannot even think of a solution or remedy to homelessness without dealing with housing. By definition, homelessness is the lack of housing for people, and our current National Government has repudiated its role in creating housing for poor people. So, the starting point of any Federal response to homelessness has got to be housing and, again, we are not talking about lavish new programs. We are talking about what has been a tradition in this country, of some of the more radical Presidents we have had in the past, like Gerald Ford and Richard Nixon, where there was bipartisan support to house poor folks.

You know, the numbers as of this year. We have had a 78-percent cut in Federal housing for poor people since 1980. If the President gets his wish this year, there will be no money to create new housing for poor people. I would take out my pedigree as a former Wall Street lawyer to say that the free market does not work, and has not worked, in this country for 50 years to create housing for poor folks, and it is no radical notion to suggest that, again, the National Government has to play a role there.

Beyond that, though, because housing is not going to be created tomorrow, there is going to be, as we sit here at the end of one winter, another winter next year. But there is going to be a massive gap between the need for emergency shelter and the supply. Even given the fairly fellacious underestimates of the problem by the Federal Government or the Reagan administration, even they acknowledged a several-hundred-thousand-bed shortfall in emergency refuges for folks like David Bright.

There has been a very scant amount of Federal money coming through the Federal agency responsible for dealing with hurricanes, earthquakes, and other natural disasters. Again, there will be a battle, I am sure this year, to get some support for soup kitchens and for emergency shelters, but that, again, is nowhere near commensurate with the need for emergency relief.

But, we need apportioned responsibility among levels of government. You may fairly look to State governments for their role in providing help for former psychiatric patients who now comprise maybe 15 or 20 percent of the Nation's homeless. But you have got to look to Washington, we have got to look to the traditions of supporting housing for poor people, if there is going to be a real solution and that solution has got to come from here, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LELAND. Let me ask you, Mr. Hayes, why would a former Wall Street lawyer do what you are doing now?

Mr. HAYES. The calibre of my clients has improved substantially, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LELAND. Very good statement.

Mr. HAYES. Next question.

Chairman LELAND. How many children have you seen who are like David here?

Mr. HAYES. I have never met anyone like David anywhere. David is a rare and aptly named young man. Last night, though, in New York's emergency shelter system, there were over 10,000 homeless

kids. The more fortunate ones lived in hotels like the one David is in, where the one Federal entitlement program for homeless people, emergency assistance to families, pays about $3,000 a month or $36,000 a year to buy this room for David, his brother, and his mother. The less fortunate kids——

Chairman LELAND. Wait, wait, wait. $36,000 a year?

Mr. HAYES. That is the bargain rate in New York. The less fortunate kids are spending nights at a shelter in the Bronx called Roberto Clemente, 200 fathers, mothers, children, in a gymnasium, with row after row of cots and cribs, cots and cribs. That is costing under the one Federal entitlement program for homeless families, $71,000 annually to shelter a family of four.

Chairman LELAND. Now, wait a minute, wait a minute. Let us back up a minute here.

To shelter a family of four, it costs $71,000 for a family of four each year.

Mr. HAYES. That is——

Chairman LELAND. Let me ask you something. Where do you live, Mr. Hayes, in New York, if I might ask? I do not mean your specific address. What part of town?

Mr. HAYES. I live in the shadow of Gracie Mansion where the mayor lives.

Chairman LELAND. Do you own or do you rent?

Mr. HAYES. Rent.

Chairman LELAND. Is your rent as high as what David is paying or, rather, what the State is paying for David to live there?

Mr. HAYES. Absolutely not. I keep underscoring one single entitlement program for homeless people in this country, the one program will pay $71,000 a year to keep mothers and kids sleeping in gyms, looking like refugees from a Third World country, but David and his mother get about $240 a month in rent for permanent housing, and not a penny more.

This is why those of us on the outside of government, including David, sometimes look in bewilderment when we are told there just is not enough money in government programs, there is just not enough resources in this society of ours so that he can have a full belly at the end of the month.

Chairman LELAND. I am flabbergasted. I just cannot fathom the State paying $36,000 a year and $360,000 in 10 years.

Am I missing some decimal points or something?

Mr. HAYES. It is bewildering.

Chairman LELAND. We could take that money and go and buy an adequate home for David and his family to live in, which would be equipped with a shower, bath, kitchen, and all the rest of the comforts of home, if you will.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, if I were sitting in the U.S. Congress or in another branch of the Federal Government, I would not only permit these funds to not be squandered in the way they are being squandered and instead permit them to be put into rehabilitating housing, permanent housing, for these families. I would mandate it. And there is no reason why the Congress cannot require that where there is such a shortfall of housing, that we stop paying so much money to these private hotel owners, who are becoming millionaires overnight, or squandering money on these gymnasiums

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

where kids are getting damaged day by day, and put it into the bricks and mortar of housing people.

There is not housing in New York and virtually every other city that these families can afford. I am from New York. David is from New York, but this is not a unique problem in New York. It is the same in almost every other major American city.

The waste of money, the lack of resources, and the suffering.

Chairman LELAND. I am just imagining how many people could be fed with some of the savings if, the $71,000 a year of State moneys was not spent on homeless shelters and long-term housing was provided instead.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, let me correct that. You keep saying the State, but so, too, is the Federal Government paying more than the State in this regard.

Chairman LELAND. Well, I understand. I am shocked, to say the least.

Mr. HAYES. It raises question of competence, certainly, in government administration.

Chairman LELAND. Well, this committee will certainly want to look into this use of public funds. While housing is not necessarily our jurisdiction, we certainly see the relationship between homelessness and hunger. We also see the problems of hunger for the homeless through David's example, we are paying such exorbitant prices to so-called house people who could be in much better conditions.

I think of all of the moneys that could be saved to be used for job training. Mrs. Roukema was talking about deinstitutionalization. Moneys could be spent also for community mental health facilities and the reinstitutionalization of some people who are absolutely in need of reinstitutionalization and, of course, the need for food assistance could be served to some degree with some of this money. This is incredible.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I think this committee is doing a terrific public service in just underscoring the fact that homelessness is simply the flip side of the same coin of hunger, and that almost every poor person in this country, and we are talking about 25 percent of the kids in this country, are faced with the choice between buying the food and paying the rent, and depending on what choice the mother or father makes, the kids are hungry or they are homeless because we are not giving them the support to avoid both those situations.

Chairman LELAND. With David living in the conditions that he lives under now, do you think that he has a fair chance of making it in our society?

Does he have a fair chance of growing up healthy, intelligent, and able to compete in this country?

Mr. HAYES. There are two answers to that question because David is here, as every child, and almost all the children who are in these hotels and are going about as wandering nomads do not have a chance. They are being damaged irrevocably day by day: Little babies all the way up to teenagers.

But there is something that keeps, I guess, all of us going, to some extent, and that is the magic in children like David. Most of these kids do not have subsistence. Almost all of these kids do not

have opportunity. But I could make a date with you in 15 years and come back with David because he will make it. He is going to be lucky, and he is going to have a few breaks, and he has met a few people who can help him.

But he is the rare case, and the rest of these kids we are not investing in. Again, from the Wall Street perspective, any organization that does not invest some of its resources in its future is going to go bankrupt.

Chairman LELAND. Let me move to Ms. Maz, if I can.

I apologize for the shock that I am in. It is unbelievable to me. I probably should not be as indignant as I am about homelessness and the cost of housing that you have stated, but it is incredible.

Ms. Maz, I was walking over to the House to vote just a few minutes ago, and my colleague from Missouri, Mr. Emerson, and I were talking. He suggested to me that we really ought to try to do what we can to help you to establish a pilot project, because it seemed only logical to us. Not only have you been articulate on that proposal, but very realistic. You offer a very simple and logical step for helping homeless people have access to adequate diets.

Can you provide for the nutritional needs of children and those with special dietary needs now without food stamps?

Ms. MAZ. Not now. What we have at Martha's Table is just a basic soup kitchen for children. They get a sandwich, soup, and something warm to drink; not a well-balanced diet at all. For many of the children this is the only place they eat.

Chairman LELAND. That is all they eat?

Ms. MAZ. Yes. Many of them, yes.

Chairman LELAND. So, if you had food stamps, you could supplement their diets with essential nutrients.

Ms. MAZ. Yes. Nutrition. That is the whole idea of the food stamp restaurant, using food stamps for nutritious foods.

Chairman LELAND. Well, I personally want to commit to you that I will work with you to try to get some commitment from USDA to help you with the pilot project. I think it would be excellent if we could use your project as an example for the Nation. It is tremendously creative and resourceful.

Let me ask you one other question. You have heard Assistant Secretary Bode's arguments against your proposal. What would you argue with him on behalf of your proposal?

Ms. MAZ. For one thing, I would collect very solid evidence about the nutritional value of meals that people are getting now and present it to Mr. Bode, since he believes that the homeless are getting nutritional food if they eat in a soup kitchen or a shelter.

But, also, Mr. Chairman, when we applied to the USDA in 1984, for the pilot project, there was not as much emphasis on the homeless, and people were not as concerned with this issue as they are today.

So, I think the attitudes are changing. People are more open.

Chairman LELAND. Up till then, people thought that the homeless were pretty much the derelicts of our society, people who were mentally ill, faceless, mindless people.

Ms. MAZ. Yes.

Chairman LELAND. And, now, we are realizing that more of the homeless are children like David and many other——

Ms. MAZ. People like us.

Chairman LELAND. You are exactly right. I was at the Pitts Hotel this morning on the select committee's site unit and I met and talked to many families there.

I met one woman with nine children, seven of whom were hers, and two neices whom she adopted when her sister died. She showed great compassion taking on the care of her two neices when she already has seven children. Today staying at the Pitts Hotel, a shelter for homeless families, she is suffering from the inability to provide for her children.

She is a very proud mother. One of her children is even in college in California. Because of her academic excellence this daughter was able to get a scholarship for her studies. The tremendous drive of that mother to have more for her children was very evident today. All they are asking for is a chance.

One of the problems, too, as she was explaining, is that there is not enough day care, so that when her children were younger she could not go out to find a job. All of her kids now are of school-age. She wants to go out and find a job, but she told me how difficult that is.

I had another experience with another young lady there, who had two children, two beautiful little girls, neither of whom are school age. She wants to work. She cannot find a job because there is no day care facility for her to drop her kids off. She told me that without the Pitts Hotel she would have absolutely nothing, nowhere to go. She told me that before she came to the Pitts Hotel she would take her two children and sleep at different peoples' homes just so that her children would have a place to be warm, a place to lay their heads.

Both the stories that I have heard here and what I saw this morning at the Pitts Hotel are incredible to me, and I am not very naive. I understand all these things. While I hear the statistics that homelessness and hunger are growing, that things are getting worse, we hear from the Government, from our President and others, and I am not being partisan here, that we have to cut back on our budget for domestic social programs lest we mortgage our future.

Well, it seems to me that we are already doing something tremendously dangerous to our future by helping to, literally in some instances, kill some of our people by casting them to be forever lost wandering around cities like New York, Houston, and Washington, DC.

What are we doing to the minds of these young people? I am very moved. I am very moved by your inspired leadership. I am moved by the sacrifices that Mr. Hayes has made and his involvement with children like David, and the sacrifices of the parents of David and other children like him. I wish that our chambers here were full of Members of Congress so that they could all hear the testimony and see the examples that all of you represent.

Let me turn to Ms. Daily now. How do you pronounce your daughter's name?

Ms. DAILY. Bayeena.

Chairman LELAND. Bayeena?

Ms. DAILY. Bayeena, yes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chairman LELAND. That is Swahili, is it not?
Ms. DAILY. Muslim.
Chairman LELAND. African?
Ms. DAILY. Muslim.
Chairman LELAND. Muslim.
Ms. DAILY. Yes.
Chairman LELAND. Oh, I see. What does it mean?
Ms. DAILY. Beautiful. Beautiful girl.
Chairman LELAND. Well, she is that, and also a little feisty this morning.

We really appreciate you coming forward and bringing your little girl here. How old is Bayeena?
Ms. DAILY. She is 5.
Chairman LELAND. Is she in school?
Ms. DAILY. Yes.
Chairman LELAND. Do you have any other children?
Ms. DAILY. Yes. I have a little boy. He is 2, and my stepson is 15.
Chairman LELAND. Are you working?
Ms. DAILY. No. I am in a training school.
Chairman LELAND. What do you do with your little boy who is 2?
Ms. DAILY. He is in day care.
Chairman LELAND. He is in day care.
Ms. DAILY. Yes.
Chairman LELAND. Who provides for that? Who pays for day care?
Ms. DAILY. The training school I am in. I think it is through the government, but they are providing child care. As a matter of fact, they pay for my daughter, too.
Chairman LELAND. What would you do if they did not pay for your daughter?
Ms. DAILY. I would not be able to go to school.
Chairman LELAND. Would you like to stay at home and take care of your children?
Ms. DAILY. No.
Chairman LELAND. I often hear remarks on the floor of the Congress and other quarters that there are a lot of people who just do not work, that all they want is to have children and so, qualify for greater welfare moneys to be given to them.

Is that the case in your family's instance or people who you know?
Ms. DAILY. Most people I know, no. I think most of them want to go to school and, in my case, I did. I want to go to school. I tried a long time ago to just go out and get a job when my children were very young, but I was not able to pay enough day care babysitting money and work as well and then maintain my household.

This was when my husband was disabled, and I did not have anything else but welfare. Then, when I did go to work, of course, welfare would—they cut my checks, which really was about the same amount as I was making if I would stay home on welfare, you know.

So, then, I just decided to stay home then, they were so young, and just take care of them.

59-645 0 - 86 - 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chairman LELAND. Are you saying that you decided that you might as well stay at home because there was no incentive for you to go to work?

Ms. DAILY. Right.

Chairman LELAND. You chose to stay home and take care of your children.

Ms. DAILY. Right. But, like I said, by me coming here to the District of Columbia, where they did have government training programs open to people that was on welfare, I jumped immediately into it, as soon as we came here in October, and by—no. We came here in October, but—the next year, after we got through the Capitol City shelter where you have to go back and forth across town, you know, by that procedure, you are unable to really do anything. You cannot look for housing. You cannot go to school. You cannot work.

But once we got over that period, then, I found out about the training program. I was able to go to school, and I could get my children in day care.

Chairman LELAND. Would you like to know something about me Ms. Daily? When I was a little boy growing up, I did not have a father at home. My mother reared two boys by herself. My mother worked at a drugstore. She made hamburgers and milk shakes and things like that, a soda jerk, so to speak, short order cook. She went to college during the day.

The only reason that we were not in the exact same circumstance that you are in right now was because we had a grandmother who provided us with a house that we could live in.

Ms. DAILY. That is correct.

Chairman LELAND. That is the only difference, and I would probably not be sitting here today had my mother not had the kind of mother that she had.

Ms. DAILY. Right.

Chairman LELAND. And, I am really appreciative of the fact that you would sacrifice some of your time to come and bring Bayeena here, just as I appreciate Mr. Hayes bringing David. The tales of homeless and hunger among families with children is a tragic story that is unfolding more mysteries every day.

Ms. DAILY. Right.

Chairman LELAND. It was said earlier by Mayor Flynn, that there are too many missiles in our silos. Even though he was technically incorrect, he has a significant point. We are spending hundreds of billions of dollars on developing weapons of destruction when, in fact, we have suffering, starving people in America. Mr. Hayes was correct when he said that our real security, let me paraphrase, our real security is our Nation's children.

Our real line of defense is with our children. I am deemed as a liberal because I am willing to cut the defense spending. If we cut defense spending only by eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse—I am not suggesting that we weaken our defense by any means—if we got rid of Mr. Weinberger and brought in an excellent manager of big business, then we could save many billions of dollars. We could then spend some of those saved moneys on enhancing the opportunities for young children like Bayeena to grow up in a more wholesome environment. She could have a mind full of ideas.

Only then will we be able to compete in the international marketplace and lower our foreign trade deficit. She could help us to solve our problems without our imbalanced budgets today. We are currently substituting madness for constructive efforts that could bring hope for these two children and millions of others living in poverty.

Ms. DAILY. Yes. And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add, too. I thought about what you said. That you were fortunate that you had a grandmother to help raise you, you know, take care of the children while your mother worked.

But, in my case, my parents died when I was very young in the year 1965, and I have no relatives here, so it is really particularly on me, by my husband being disabled, it is like, in a sense, I have to raise him, too, and, again, as you were saying about young children, at her age, they are hungry and thirsty for knowledge, and they want to learn, constantly they want to learn, and when they do not get the opportunity, it is a waste. It is just a waste, and something that could be used.

It is something that can be built off of with their knowledge.

Chairman LELAND. Well, let me just thank all of you for being here today. Your contributions have been invaluable. What you have said here and the examples that you represent are now recorded as part of this congressional hearing.

I want to just thank you very, very much for something that has moved me, reinspired me, and I would hope that the committee can be very helpful to all of your plights.

Thank you so much.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you.

Chairman LELAND. The Chair would like to now bring forward the next panel for their testimony. A person who we have heard from in one way already and that is Trevor Farrell, a 13-year-old boy, who began his own shelter for the homeless outside of Philadelphia and has brought other children and adults together to serve the homeless.

The winner of many awards for his commitment and services to the poor, Trevor recently gained national recognition for his outstanding efforts for the homeless in the President's 1986 State of the Union Address.

The last witness is Mary Curran, director at the Community of Hope Family Shelter for homeless families in Northwest Washington, DC.

Ms. Curran assists homeless families in dealing with their social and emotional problems. As a member of the District of Columbia Shelter Providers Council and a board member at another local shelter for women, she offers us a citywide perspective on the causes and consequences of hunger among the homeless.

Thank you all for being here. Trevor, you are here with an associate. Before you make your testimony, please introduce him to us.

Master FERRELL. Yes. This is my dad, Frank Ferrell.

Chairman LELAND. We want to welcome you here, Mr. Ferrell. Thank you so much for accompanying Trevor today.

Mr. FERRELL. Thank you for the opportunity.

Chairman LELAND. You are very welcome. Do you want to proceed?

## STATEMENT OF TREVOR FERRELL, A 13-YEAR-OLD BOY RUNNING A HOMELESS SHELTER, TREVOR'S CAMPAIGN FOR THE HOMELESS, ARDMORE, PA

Master FERRELL. Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, on December 8, 1983, I could not believe my eyes. I saw street people, Philadelphia's homeless, on TV on a report. I just had to do something.

I asked my mom and dad to take me in that night to give them something, and that night my parents took me in. We had no idea how many people actually lived on the streets. I do not think anybody knows.

Since then, we have been feeding, clothing, and sheltering men, women, children, even babies. Mom and dad say we are just scratching the surface, but what we need are people in Philadelphia and around the country to help scratch that surface.

I went to Mother Teresa's in India, Calcutta, and I do not want to see what I saw there here in America. Martin Luther King had a dream for his people and it came true. I also have a dream for my homeless and hungry friends. I hope and pray that it will come true.

Over the last 2 years, our lives have changed and with your help other lives can be changed.

Thank you very much.

### RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR TREVOR FERRELL

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MICKEY LELAND

*Question.* How do you recommend that we raise the consciousness of individual Members of Congress to the plight of the homeless?

Answer. A. Invite individual who work with the homeless to present facts about homelessness, that is, that homelessness appears to be increasing due to powerful social/economic forces over which individuals have little control.

B. Appoint a task force to obtain the facts needed to gain a better understanding of homelessness.

*Question.* Do you see a need for any public funds to provide assistance for the homeless?

Answer. Yes, definitely. The current need for housing and supportive services for homeless individuals is far greater than can be provided by the private sector.

*Question.* At the hearing you mentioned the need to ease food stamp eligibility for the homeless. What specific barriers to participation in the program have prevented residents of Trevor's Place from receiving these food benefits?

Answer. Due to bureaucratic redtape, of the public assistance agency the decision regarding eligibility for food stamps is often delayed.

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

First of all, I would like to congratulate you on your outstanding efforts. Your work is an example of the true American humanitarian spirit which has been a tradition in this country.

*Question.* Can you tell me, Trevor, how many people live in your shelter? Are their children in the shelter?

Answer. Current population: 23 adults and 9 children.

*Question.* Do you have any suggestions for people who want to help—how should they begin?

Answer. First talk with some homeless persons. Seek out individuals and organizations working with homeless individuals. Out of those interactions should evolve an awareness of needs and some ideas as how to be responsive to these needs.

*Question.* Do you receive any money from the Federal Government for you shelter and food programs? Do you recieve any USDA commodities?

Answer. No.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[Material submitted by Master Ferrell appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 253.]

Chairman LELAND. Trevor, thank you very, very much.

Ms. Curran.

## STATEMENT OF MARY CURRAN, DIRECTOR, COMMUNITY OF HOPE FAMILY SHELTER, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. CURRAN. Two things kept coming back to me in the hearings today.

One is the idea that homeless people are eligible for, particularly, food stamps or commodity-type foods, and I think it needs to be recognized that there is a difference between eligibility and accessibility, and it has been my experience over 13 years in the District of Columbia, that it is very difficult to make food stamps accessible to homeless people.

In fact, this fact that people have an address often is a problem, particularly if that address is connected with what is known to be within the city system, a shelter, and it is very difficult to convey to the system that there are different levels of shelters. Some provide three meals a day, some provide no food, some provide one training or another.

But to try to convey the fact that a person is in a shelter does not necessarily mean that all of that person's needs are being met. It is very difficult, and I would like to particularly stress that with persons who have medical problems, there is a great need for that to be recognized with people who are homeless.

Because these individuals continually have to eat food which actually makes them sick. For instance, in the District of Columbia, one of the big problems among the black population is hypertension. Of all black females 26 percent suffer from hypertension, 16 percent are borderline hypertensive, which means that they have to be very careful in terms of the type of foods they eat, particularly related to sodium, starch-type foods, things with sugar, and it is very difficult to convey that at the local level to people in food stamp offices.

My experience here has been that it is impossible to get food stamps for someone in the shelter system if the shelter provides them one meal, and what we are told over and over again is that if the shelter provides any food at all, the person is ineligible. It is true that you can ask for fair hearing, you can request that someone listen to what you have to say, but it is also true that that is very difficult often to attain, and if you are able to get a fair hearing, it may take 45 to 60 days just to be able to go in and be heard.

So, that is one situation. I feel that particularly with food stamps and also with some medical assistance, eligibility and accessibility are two different issues.

The other issue that has come to me over and over today is that I feel that there needs to be a distinction made between single homeless individuals and single families because the psychosocial makeup of those two groups and the ways in which plans need to be implemented to allow those groups to make progress and to move out of their situation is very different, I think, and the types of problems that exist in those two groups are different.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

You were at the Pitts Hotel this morning. The Community of Hope is on that same block, just up the street. The Community of Hope is designed to begin to help particularly young mothers become self-sufficient, and I think that is one thing that people are unaware of or has not gotten a lot of attention either is that particularly in the District of Columbia, where we have a tremendous problem with teenage pregnancy, many of the women now being recognized as homeless, particularly within the family unit, are very young and have spent at least 4 of their 5 or 6 teenage years in foster care, and those women need to come—need to be in a semiresidential type program, where they can gain the living skills and the educational skills that often were not afforded them during teenage years.

I think that, I would hope that, at least within the District, there would be some recognition in the future that places like the Pitts Hotel would be used as intake facilities and that families would not have to stay there for months and months and months and months, but that there could be increasing usage of second and third stage shelters which are primarily provided by the private or nonprofit sector, in which families, like the Daily family, can stay anywhere from 3 months to 1 year, and an assessment is done of what are the things that are contributing to this family being homeless.

Sometimes they are economics. Sometimes there is a need for that young parent to be repaired. Sometimes there is the need for the opportunity for vocational training or job placement, but with the second stage shelter, a person is able to come in and we do a good assessment to see how can we help this family eventually become self-sufficient, and I have been appalled, too, at the amount of money that it costs for a family to continue to stay in an intake-type shelter, which is what you saw today.

The Community of Hope is a community nonprofit organization. We offer not only housing, but also we have a health clinic. We have a vocational training, Jobs Program. We have a program for educational and developmental type things with children. We have law offices and services, legal services.

We offer those things to all of our clients for $14.55 a day in comparison to over $90 a day per person in an intake shelter, and we are able to do that because we are nonprofit. We cannot do it alone, and I guess that is what I am here to say today. In order for nonprofits and community organizations to exist and to do their job well, they need the assistance of Federal and State Governments, but I feel that nonprofits, like Ms. Maz was saying, really are committed to cost efficiency and also to the personal relationship and interaction with the client.

That may be the key factor really in motivating that person to move out of poverty and into more productive lifestyle.

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR MARY CURRAN

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY HON. MICKEY LELAND

*Question.* From your experience as a social worker at the community of hope and as a part of the District of Columbia network of shelter providers do eligible homeless individuals and families have difficulty obtaining food stamp benefits for which they are eligible? If so what are the specific reasons? Please provide us with any

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

specific data on the numbers of individuals affected and/or case examples of eligible homeless denied food stamps?

Answer. No response received in time for printing.

*Question.* Food stamp regulations specifically state that residents of institutions providing over 50 percent of meals are not eligible for food stamps. In the District of Columbia are there homeless persons denied food stamps because they reside in shelters, though these shelters are not institutions according to USDA regulations?

Answer. No response received in time for printing.

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

*Question.* Do you or any of those you serve have problems that require psychological care?

Answer. Approximately 65 percent of the homeless clients served at Community of Hope suffer from mental health or substance abuse problems which either require or would be substantially helped by psychological services. Depression—severe * * * causing dysfunction and alcoholism are presenting problems with homeless women with children.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Curran appears at the conclusion of the hearing, see p. 267.]

Chairman LELAND. Thank you very much.

Having gone to the Pitts Hotel this morning, I was awakened to the reality of life for homeless families in the District of Columbia. I know that your shelter is rather small and is thus able to provide more one-on-one supportive services.

Ms. CURRAN. Right.

Chairman LELAND. What happens to people who do not get that kind of service?

Ms. CURRAN. Well, there are, I believe, three or four other shelters like Community of Hope, but there are not enough second stage shelters for the number of people that come into intake.

What generally happens with those people is they repeat the shelter cycle. They become chronically—chronic users of the shelter system. There needs to be the understanding, too, I think, that if a person repeats that experience more than twice, then that really does become a chronic way of life, and it is very unfortunate, particularly when you recognize that at the same time whatever problems are beginning to build along with that, which may be depression, it may be alcoholism, the constant chaos of life causes people then to turn to coping mechanisms that are not appropriate and are not good.

So, then, that is intensified also as you get a person who has been in the shelter now for the third time, it is very difficult even for a program like ours to help that person, but if you can get that young mother, this is her first experience, and really work with her, encourage her and let her know that she can work, in some cases, a man and a woman, let them know that they can parent their children, and we are here to help you take hold of what is here for you to learn and what is here for you to make some opportunities for yourself, they will repeat the shelter system again.

Chairman LELAND. Trevor, let me ask you. Do you have friends who feel as you do and who work with you in Philadelphia?

Master FERRELL. Friends from school help me out, and they teased me in the beginning, said you help those people and then I said why do you not come on the van one night and help me help people, and they said OK, and they tried it and they enjoyed it, and

wanted to do it more, and there is a lot of people who thought it was going to be stupid at first, then enjoyed it.

Chairman LELAND. So, now, they are pretty much committed like you are?

Master FERRELL. Yes.

Chairman LELAND. They must be awfully proud of you.

Master FERRELL. Well, a lot of them help more than I do. They help the people twice and three times a week. I would like to do that, but I do not have the time.

Chairman LELAND. I bet that guy next to you is really proud of you.

Mr. FERRELL. Yes.

Chairman LELAND. Let me hear some reflections from your daddy, if I may.

Mr. FERRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One, for the opportunity of allowing us to be here, and to hear Trevor give a testimony that is from his heart. A couple of years ago, I looked at myself and said, "gee, there is a bleeding heart liberal if there ever was one," and—but, my heart does bleed. It is bleeding for those folks that are out there on the streets, and that do not have anybody to care for them.

I also share the same opinion and views that so many that have testified today in easing food stamp eligibility restrictions, clarifying requirements for food stamps, and I made a couple of little notes and I will quickly go down those.

I would also welcome the repeal, or the rescinding, or reversing of the Supreme Court ruling that flushed out or pushed out so many people from mental institutions. So many of the people we meet are chronically mentally ill, walking around mumbling to themselves. We see them here in Washington and all the major cities, and there is no support, no universal community support system to help those people.

Those agencies that do address that situation, those existing agencies are not being fully utilized. Trevor's Place or Trevor's Campaign is taking advantage of those services. Youngsters. And, it seems strange but there is a magical solution in having youngsters involved in holding hands with people, not threatening them, not judging them for where they are, but just walking with them over to see a counselor at a mental health retardation center that has been in existence for quite awhile.

I often mention that it is as though we come on the scene of an accident and a man is laying in a pool of blood. You do not look down at him and say well, why are you here, whose fault was it, did you see the light or—you immediately administer some first aid.

Trevor's Place is a home for 28 to 29 people at the moment, 9 youngsters. We do not hold it up as the solution or the answer, but it is an answer; for those folks that are living there, it is their answer.

It is providing more than a temporary overnight shelter or a bed and breakfast. It is providing a home that is in a caring atmosphere where a counselor will talk with them and uncover and discover skills that many of those people have wonderful talents that are not being utilized. They are not even aware themselves of gifts

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that they have, and a little kid like this, who is no different from any other child, listens to his heart, reaches out and says, "You are in pain and I am with you in that pain and I am not judging you for where you are."

I wish everybody could sit in my shoes and see the other kids and other adults. That is Trevor's little cue that I am rambling when he coughs like that, but there are now—there is a bridge being gapped between the suburbs of the city and our city. People that have so very much reaching out to those that have zilch, that have nothing, in alleys and doorways and laying on grates.

The volunteers that are involved are really—it is a two-way street. They are getting a great deal of satisfaction and feeling of self-worth for helping those people.

I would like to see a corporate and the private sector working together. The corporate community, the business community, is just throwing their hands up and they say the situation is so overwhelming, why even try to attack the problem. You would just be throwing money down a bottomless pit.

I would like to see encouragement of corporate intervention, corporate involvement, in reaching a solution. I certainly do not have the answers. This little kid does not have the answers, but I think working in some kind of harmony to plug up the holes and the gaps in the safety net that is almost nonexistent because people are falling through.

I agree with Mayor Flynn that I think job training is essential. The celebration that goes on at Trevor's Place when someone gets a job and then they move on to a permanent house that is their own, an apartment somewhere. We do not have 1,000 success stories, but we have got some people that have changed their lives.

A young girl who is now a student at Philadelphia Community College in Philadelphia, is a straight A student, who not too long ago was living on the streets. She is a straight A student. She has just been admitted to the National Honors Scholastic Society, Phi Beta Kappa, and next year, she is a candidate for being a student at Bryn Mawr College, and that is a person that normally you would walk around and you would just say oh, she is wasted, she is—does not deserve any compassion.

Frequently, people just look at those folks out on the streets and say they want to be there, they do not want to lift themselves up, but I know from personal hands-on experience that so many of them, they want to work, they want to find jobs, they want to be self-sufficient, self-sustaining, not relying on food stamps and government aid.

Chairman LELAND. Mr. Ferrell and Trevor, you do agree that we need the Federal Government, local and State governments, and the private sector working together.

I tend to disagree with you when you say that you do not have any solutions. You and that kid there. You have provided one invaluable solution as far as I am concerned. You have plugged up the gap. You saw a hole in the so-called safety net and you took your knitting needle and you wove a vital safety catch.

Now, the whole Nation knows what you have done, and, hopefully, Trevor's examples, more young people like him will fall in line

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and do more for others as opposed to some of the other activities common amongst our young people.

Ms. Curran, do you agree with most of the tenets that have been put forth by Mr. Ferrell and Trevor?

Ms. CURRAN. Yes. And, I agree with what you are saying, too, in terms of Trevor and in terms of community organizations that it may seem like a very small thing you are doing. The Community of Hope generally serves about 40 families a year. That is small in comparison to the number of homeless families in the city.

However, in 3 years, we have served almost a 100 families, all but 3 of those families are still totally self-sufficient, and, so, I think there is no way to measure the small amount that any number of groups can do.

I would like to add one thing or one request that I think is important. The families who come to us, you were at the Pitts today, I think just in general, you would be willing to say those families should be eligible upon entering our shelter for food stamps or AFDC. Whatever it is that they need initially to make them stable financially.

It is a continuous problem and an unbelievable one that often families will be with us anywhere from 6 weeks to 2 months and still have not received food stamps. It is really a distressing thing to know that even with professional social workers advocating for them downtown, they are still not receiving the benefits that are coming to them, and that is not cost effective because they are not there to spend their days going out getting food from this church or that or whatever. They are there to begin their job training, vocational training, of whatever type, and get their children in day care and things that will allow them to move on.

One of the ways that I think could be very helpful in terms of the shelter system, particularly second and third stage shelters, is for—whether it is food stamps, AFDC, Medicaid, or whoever, those agencies, if they would allow one person to do the intakes or if the caseload were too much, two persons to do the intake on the families from a particular shelter or two or three shelters, those intake persons then would understand what that shelter was about and would know that people there are eligible, instead of taking so much time to establish eligibility and then, even after eligibility is established, so many more weeks for people to begin to receive their benefits.

I think that would be really helpful, particularly here in the District, and just in terms of personal motivation, when families come expecting to do their own—their career assessment, begin their training, get their medical needs taken care of, get their children in day care, and then they have to spend weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks just wasting time because, obviously, they are eligible. They have just come from one district facility and moved into another district facility, and they have to go through a whole reevaluation again. It is not cost effective at all.

Chairman LELAND. Trevor, do you have any additional comments you would like to make?

Master FERRELL. Well, a lot of people say that it is the Government's fault that the people are on the streets, and the Government should do more about the homeless and hungry and people,

but I think that everybody should help together, like my dad said, to solve the problem.

And, I know that the President cares for people because I was in his office—when was that?

Chairman LELAND. I remember the time.

Master FERRELL. Yes, sir. When the space shuttle had the accident, and he had tears in his eyes, when he found out about it, and that told me that he did care and that is how I know the President cares.

Chairman LELAND. Well, I certainly hope with your help that we can convince the President to do a few other things that we need done for the hungry and the homeless. I think this President cares, too. You know, our real differences come when we try to reach a goal, because we do it in different ways.

Sometimes we get at loggerheads and we do not necessarily end up at the same place. I hope that people like you and your example, can convince the President that we all need to work together. You have convinced me, and I appreciate that. I appreciate all of you who have participated.

Mr. Ferrell.

Mr. FERRELL. Well, I thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want you to know that I was very impressed with the sensitivity of the way you have conducted this hearing, and it was a privilege and an honor for me to be here, and I thank you so much.

Chairman LELAND. Thank you very much.

Let me say that each and every member of the Select Committee on Hunger is a very compassionate person, and I have witnessed them in different kinds of settings. Settings that are not usual for Members of Congress.

Some of us were in Ethiopia together, where we saw the worst horror that humankind could witness, and many of us cried on each other's shoulders. We were Republicans and Democrats, Liberals and Conservatives, together. When we came back we evangelized on the issue were able to do a lot to help the people of Ethiopia.

We have gone all over the country together in different kinds of hearings. We have had a chance to exchange views. I think that each of us got on the committee to try to help to solve the very serious problem of hunger amongst people, not only in this country, but all over the world. I am particularly proud and feel very privileged to be Chair of this committee of compassionate members on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats. Even though sometimes we fight and argue about how we ought to get things done, I know that all of us want to see everybody get fed or feed themselves and have a home.

One of the most conservative Members of Congress that I know is Bill Emerson from Missouri. After hearing Ms. Maz, as he and I were walking across to the Capitol, he said, "We've got to help her, we've got to talk to the administration and see what we can do to help her." It is that kind of compassion that I have been privileged to witness. We will fight about whether we should expand the Food

Stamp Program or other things, but I think that given the opportunity we will all help to try to feed hungry people.

Thank you so much for your invaluable contributions.

The committee meeting is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:36 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MICKEY LELAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS AND CHAIRMAN, SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

GOOD MORNING. THE SELECT COMMITTEE CONVENES THIS MORNING TO ADDRESS THE SERIOUS PROBLEM OF HUNGER AMONG AMERICA'S HOMELESS CITIZENS. THIS HEARING BEGINS OUR INVESTIGATION INTO THE ACCESSIBILITY OF ADEQUATE FOOD ASSISTANCE FOR THE HOMELESS, PARTICULARLY FOR THE INCREASING NUMBER OF HOMELESS FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.

IN ESTABLISHING THE FEDERAL FOOD PROGRAMS WE MADE A COMMITMENT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THAT THE GOVERNMENT WOULD DO ITS BEST TO HELP FEED THOSE WHO COULD NOT FEED THEMSELVES. I AM SAD TO SAY THAT THE SERIES OF HEARINGS THE SELECT COMMITTEE HAS HELD OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS REVEALS THAT WE ARE NOT ACCOMPLISHING THIS MISSION. THERE ARE MANY GROUPS WITHIN OUR SOCIETY WHO ARE NOW VULNERABLE TO HUNGER BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT PROVIDED ADEQUATE GOVERNMENT AND/OR PRIVATE FOOD ASSISTANCE. THE HOMELESS, THE SUBJECT OF OUR INVESTIGATIONS TODAY, ARE ONE OF THE WORST CASE EXAMPLES.

WE HAVE JUST RETURNED FROM A BREAKFAST SITE VISIT AT THE PITTS HOTEL, A TEMPORARY SHELTER PROVIDING ROOMS FOR 50 HOMELESS FAMILIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SERVING MEALS FOR ALL THE HOMELESS FAMILIES IN TEMPORARY SHELTERS FUNDED THROUGHOUT THE DISTRICT. I WAS IMPRESSED BY THE CARING AND COMMITMENT OF THE WORKERS AT THE PITTS HOTEL. YET THE DISMAL LIFE SITUATIONS OF THESE PARENTS AND CHILDREN WAS DISTURBING. I SAW MOTHERS AND FATHERS WHO TRAVEL EACH DAY ACROSS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE CITY WITH THEIR BELONGINGS, THEIR CHILDREN AND THEIR BABIES' INFANT FORMULA. THEY SPEND MOST OF THEIR ENERGY EACH DAY TRAVELLING FOR MEALS, FEEDING THEIR CHILDREN, AND TRYING TO SECURE SHELTER FOR THE NEXT NIGHT. WHILE I WISH THAT EACH HOMELESS CHILD WOULD WAKE UP TOMORROW WITH A PLACE TO CALL HOME, I KNOW THE SAD TRUTH.

THE PROBLEM OF HOMELESSNESS AMONG FAMILIES IN THIS COUNTRY IS NOT GOING TO END TOMORROW. SOCIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS FROM BOTH URRAN AND RURAL AREAS ACROSS THE NATION REPORT THAT THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN WHO ARE HOMELESS HAS CONTINUED TO GROW SIGNIFICANTLY OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS. DURING 1985, THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, REPORTS THAT 22 MAJOR METROPOLITAN AREAS EXPERIENCED AN AVERAGE INCREASE OF 25 PERCENT IN THE DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER.

HERE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, THE NUMBER OF HOMELESS PARENTS AND CHILDREN PROVIDED TEMPORARY SHELTER MORE THAN DOUBLED BETWEEN 1983 AND 1985. LAST YEAR THE CITY ASSISTED 2,170 HOMELESS CHILDREN AND 1,162 PARENTS IN TEMPORARY AND TRANSITIONAL FAMILY SHELTERS. CURRENTLY THERE ARE 10,000 HOUSEHOLDS ON THE WAITING LIST FOR D.C. PUBLIC HOUSING. IN MY HOME DISTRICT OF HOUSTON, THE REPORTS ARE SIMILAR. EMERGENCY SHELTER PROVIDERS THERE TELL ME THAT THE PROBLEM WILL WORSEN IN 1986 WITH THE DRAMATIC INCREASES IN UNEMPLOYMENT EXPECTED TO RESULT FROM THE FALL IN OIL PRICES AND RELATED INDUSTRIES.

DISCUSSIONS OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE HOMELESS HAVE BECOME MIRED IN POLITICAL DEBATE OVER NUMBERS AND CAUSES. AS A RESULT, MANY HAVE LOST COMPASSION FOR THE INDIVIDUALS WHO EACH DAY FACE LIVING WITHOUT THE SECURITY OF KNOWING WHERE THEY WILL SLEEP OR HOW THEY WILL FEED THIER CHILDREN. I WAS REMINDED OF THIS LOSS OF COMPASSION FOR THE HOMELESS LAST WEEK. ONE OF MY STAFF RECOUNTED A CONVERSATION SHE HAD WITH AN INDIVIDUAL WHO SAID TO HER THAT HUNGER COULD NOT BE A PROBLEM FOR THE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HOMELESS BECAUSE THERE WILL ALWAYS BE ENOUGH FOOD IN DUMPSTERS.

LET US STOP DEBATING OVER THE NUMBERS AND CAUSES OF HOMELESSNESS AND AGREE THAT THERE ARE TOO MANY HOMELESS PERSONS. WHILE PRIVATE CITIZENS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS MUST BE APPLAUDED FOR THEIR COMMENDABLE STRIDES IN FEEDING AND SHELTERING THE HOMELESS, WE MUST BE WILLING TO RECOGNIZE THAT FOR THE HOMELESS, FOOD AND SHELTER IS STILL AN AMERICAN DREAM.

DR. MYRON WINICK, PROFESSOR OF NUTRITION AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, WHO HAS SUBMITTED TESTIMONY FOR THE RECORD TODAY, STATES THAT THE HOMELESS POPULATION HAS SPECIAL NUTRITIONAL NEEDS THAT ARE NOT BEING MET UNDER PRESENT CONDITIONS, EVEN FOR THOSE WHO ARE LIVING IN SHELTER FACILITIES. SPECIFICALLY, DR. WINICK HAS FOUND DEFICIENCIES IN CALORIES, CALCIUM, IRON, VITAMINS AND MINERALS AMONG THE HOMELESS. FOR THOSE HOMELESS WITH CHRONIC HEALTH PROBLEMS, SUCH AS HIGH BLOOD PRESSURE OR DIABETES, HE REPORTS THEY ARE NOT GETTING THE SPECIAL DIETS AND NUTRITIONAL SUPPLEMENTS REQUIRED. HOMELESS CHILDREN WILL SUFFER BOTH EMOTIONALLY AND PHYSICALLY. IF THEY DO NOT RECEIVE ADEQUATE NUTRITION THIER PHYSICAL AND MENTAL DEVELOPMENT CAN BE STUNTED FOR LIFE.

MR. DON JOHNSON, THE DIRECTOR OF A PRIVATE, NON-PROFIT FAMILY SHELTER AT THE STAR OF HOPE MISSION IN HOUSTON, HAS SENT ME A LETTER DESCRIBING THE INCREASING NUMBER OF HOMELESS FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN COMING TO HIS SOUP KITCHEN FOR MEALS. THIS JANUARY HE EXPANDED HIS SHELTER FOR SINGLE MEN TO PROVIDE ROOMS FOR FAMILIES. THE PARENTS AND CHILDREN, HE EXPLAINED, ARE NOT GETTING FOOD STAMPS THOUGH

THEY ARE INCOME ELIGIBLE. HE HAS BEEN ABLE TO PROVIDE THESE FAMILIES WITH HOT MEALS COOKED WITH U.S.D.A. SURPLUS, DONATED FOODS AND SURPLUS FOODS FROM MANUFACTURERS AND RETAILERS. MR. JOHNSON IS WORRIED THAT THE SUPPLY OF DONATED AND LOW COST FOOD FOR THE HOMELESS WILL NOT CONTINUE TO MEET THE NEED. AS THE NUMBERS OF HUNGRY PERSONS INCREASES, HE MUST COLLECT HIGHER VOLUMES OF FOOD FOR HIS SOUP KITCHEN. HOWEVER, HE IS NOW COMPETING WITH OTHER PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS IN HOUSTON FOR SCARCE RESOURCES. FURTHER, HE FINDS HIMSELF ALSO COMPETING WITH DOG FOOD MANUFACTURERS AND HOG FARMERS TO OBTAIN SURPLUS FOOD ITEMS NECESSARY TO PREPARE MEALS FOR THE HOMELESS.

ACCORDING TO A JANUARY, 1986 NEW YORK TIMES/CBS NEWS POLL, THE MAJORITY OF ADULT AMERICANS THINK GOVERNMENT IS NOT DEMONSTRATING ENOUGH CONCERN FOR THE HOMELESS. IT IS MY HOPE THAT THE FEDERAL AGENCIES AND CONGRESS WILL RESPOND TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE'S CALL. WHILE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ENCOURAGE CONTINUED LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE-SECTOR EFFORTS, WE CANNOT AFFORD TO BE PASSIVE. WE MUST INVEST NOW IN PREVENTIVE AND REMEDIAL SERVICES FOR THE HOMELESS THAT ARE COST-EFFICIENT AND CAN REDUCE THE FEDERAL DEFICIT. WE DO NOT NEED NEW ELABORATE PROGRAMS, BUT, INSTEAD, WE MUST DIRECT OUR MONIES TO ACTIVELY REACH OUT TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO THOSE HOMELESS PERSONS WHO ARE CURRENTLY ELIGIBLE FOR, BUT NOT PARTICIPATING IN, FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

WE HAVE A VERY DISTINGUISHED LIST OF WITNESSES BEFORE US. THESE INDIVIDUALS REPRESENT NATIONAL AND LOCAL CONCERNS WORKING TO IMPROVE LIFE FOR THE POOR AND HOMELESS. WE ALSO HAVE A HOMELESS INDIVIDUALS WHO CAN TELL US WHAT IT IS LIKE EACH DAY FOR THEIR FAMILY TO STRUGGLE IN OBTAINING ADEQUATE FOOD AND SHELTER.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS
MICKEY LELAND, TEXAS
CHAIRMAN
TONY P. HALL, OHIO
BOB TRAXLER, MICHIGAN
LEON E. PANETTA, CALIFORNIA
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, SOUTH DAKOTA
VIC FAZIO, CALIFORNIA
SAM GEJDENSON, CONNECTICUT
PETER H. KOSTMAYER, PENNSYLVANIA
SALA N. BURTON, CALIFORNIA
BYRON L. DORGAN, NORTH DAKOTA

AMANDA G. KATSOYANNIS
STAFF DIRECTOR

TELEPHONE (202) 226-5470

# U.S. House of Representatives

SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER
ROOM H2-507, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING, ANNEX NO. 2
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

## BACKGROUND FACTS: HUNGER AMONG THE HOMELESS

### HOMELESSNESS INCREASING

-- In 1983, 1984, and 1985 the demand for emergency shelter has increased dramatically in both major metropolitan and rural areas.
-- U.S. Conference of Mayors reports an increased demand of 25% (avg.) in 22 of 25 cities surveyed during 1985. (1)

### FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN COMPRISE A LARGE PERCENTAGE OF THE HOMELESS (1)

-- In 25 major U.S. cities: 27% of the homeless are families;
-- New York City: 66% of the homeless are families;
-- Boston and Chicago: 40% of the homeless are families.

### CAUSES

-- Recent economic factors are the major cause of homelessness, particularly among families. (1,2,3,4)

| Economic Factors | Other Factors |
|---|---|
| - Unemployment | - Deinstitutionalization of mentally ill persons and lack of available community-based services |
| - Cuts in public assistance | - Substance abuse |
| - Lack of affordable housing | - Family Problems |
| | - Disasters |

### MAJOR SOURCES OF FOOD FOR HOMELESS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| - Soup Kitchens | - Trash Cans | - Restaurants |
| - Shelters Serving Meals | - Handouts | - Food Purchased at Stores |

### UNMET NUTRITIONAL NEEDS

According to shelter operators and emergency food providers, the homeless depend primarily on soup kitchens for food. However, in some communties there are no soup kitchens. In Ohio, for example, 13.4% of shelter providers report no soup kitchens to feed the homeless in their area. (4)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Further, soup kitchens that do exist are not able to serve the basic nutritional needs of the homeless. Dr. Myron Winick, Professor of Nutrition at Columbia University, reports, "...the homeless population has specific nutritional problems and therefore specific nutritional needs. These are not being met under present conditions, even in the shelter facilities." Specifically, Dr. Winick states that the major deficiencies among the homeless are in calories, calcium, iron, vitamins and minerals. Many of the homeless have chronic health problems, including high blood pressure, which require special diets and nutritional supplements. (5)

**INACCESSIBILITY OF FOOD STAMP BENEFITS**

The President's Task Force on Food Assistance found that the homeless in 19 States were being denied eligibility for Food Stamps because they have no fixed address. The Food Security Act of 1985 specifically requires States to redress this problem. However, many providers and advocates for the homeless report that the homeless are denied eligibility for food stamps because they are sleeping in a so-called "institution".

**OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS POTENTIALLY AVAILABLE TO FEED HOMELESS**

Even with the availability of other Federal Programs (Emergency Food and Shelter Program; Supplemental Feeding Program for Women, Infants and Children; Food Donation Program for Charitable Institutions; and State funds in the Community Service Block Grants) which could be tapped to feed the homeless, service providers report the homeless depend on the major sources of food listed above.

**REFERENCES FOR "HUNGER AMONG THE HOMELESS" FACT SHEET**

1) U.S. Conference of Mayors, The Growth of Hunger, Homelessness and Poverty in America's Cities: A 25 City Survey, January,1986.

2) HUD Office for Policy Development and Research, A Report to the Secretary on the Homeless and Emergency Shelters, May, 1984.

3) General Accounting Office, Homelesseness: A Complex Problem And The Federal Response, April 9, 1985.

4) Ohio Department of Mental Health, Homelessness in Ohio: a Study of People in Need, February 1985.

5) Winick, Myron, "Nutritional and Vitamin Deficiency States" in Health Care of Homeless People, Springer Publishing Co., 1985 (Chapter submitted for the Hearing record by Dr Winick).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MARGE ROUKEMA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

THIS MORNING WE ARE HERE TO INVESTIGATE THE PROBLEM OF HUNGER AMONG THE HOMELESS IN THIS COUNTRY. AS A MEMBER OF BOTH THE SELECT COMMITTEE AND THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, I AM PARTICULARLY INTERESTED IN TODAY'S TESTIMONY.

SOME OF THE MOST DISTURBING PROBLEMS IN AMERICA TODAY ARE DEMONSTRATED BY THE THOUSANDS OF PEOPLE WHO LIVE ON OUR STREETS AND IN SHELTERS. THEY ARE THERE FOR A MYRIAD OF PSYCHOLOGICAL, EMOTIONAL AND ECONOMIC REASONS. THEY ARE A SET OF DISTRESSING AND UNSETTLING PROBLEMS TO DISCUSS, BECAUSE THE DISCUSSION HOLDS UP A MIRROR TO THE FACE OF SOCIETY. AND LIKE SNOW WHITE'S WICKED STEPMOTHER, WE DON'T LIKE THE UGLY FACTS WE SEE.

THOSE WHO ARE CURRENTLY HOMELESS ARE NOT A HOMOGENOUS GROUP, AND THE REASONS FOR THEIR HOMELESSNESS ARE NUMEROUS. TODAY'S HOMELESS INCLUDE THOSE WITH ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS, WOMEN AS WELL AS MEN, FAMILIES AS WELL AS SINGLE PERSONS, PEOPLE WHO HAVE NEVER BEEN EMPLOYED AND PEOPLE WHO ARE RECENTLY UNEMPLOYED, AND PEOPLE OF ALL RACES AND ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THERE ARE MANY TRENDS OCCURRING IN OUR SOCIETY WHICH HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE PROBLEM OF HOMELESSNESS. THESE INCLUDE THE RESULTS OF THE CHANGE IN THE SOCIAL AND SEXUAL MORES OF OUR SOCIETY SUCH AS HIGH DIVORCE RATES AND TEENAGE PREGNANCY; ECONOMIC DISLOCATION DUE TO DEINDUSTRIALIZATION AND THE INCREASE IN HIGH TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIES; THE LOSS OF INEXPENSIVE HOUSING BECAUSE OF URBAN REDEVELOPMENT; AND INCREASED DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE.

MOST IMPORTANTLY, HOWEVER, I BELIEVE THAT THE POLICY OF DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE MENTALLY ILL AND NON-ADMISSION OF MENTALLY ILL PERSONS TO INSTITUTIONS HAS HAD THE GREATEST IMPACT UPON HOMELESSNESS IN THIS COUNTRY. THERE HAVE BEEN SEVERAL STUDIES WHICH SHOW THAT A SIGNIFICANT PROPORTION--ANYWHERE FROM 25 TO 90 PERCENT--OF HOMELESS PERSONS ARE MENTALLY ILL. IN ADDITION, MANY HAVE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEPENDENCY.

THE DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION MOVEMENT, BEGUN IN THE 1960'S AND DESIGNED TO CREATE A MORE HUMANE MENTAL HEALTH SYSTEM AND AS A PERCEIVED REFORM OF CIVIL LIBERTARIANS, HAS BEEN A TRAGIC FAILURE. IT HAS RESULTED IN MANY MENTALLY ILL PERSONS ENDING UP ON THE STREETS OR IN SHELTERS AND HAS FUNDAMENTALLY ALTERED THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION. INITIALLY, THE MAJORITY OF PERSONS WHO WERE CHRONICALLY MENTALLY ILL AND WHO BECAME HOMELESS WERE MIDDLE-AGE AND HAD BEEN HOSPITALIZED FOR LENGTHY PERIODS. MORE RECENTLY, YOUNGER PERSONS WHO HAVE HAD

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LITTLE OR NO CONTACT WITH THE MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM HAVE BECOME PART OF THE HOMELESS POPULATION.

MANY OF THE HOMELESS MENTALLY ILL CAN COPE ONLY TO A LIMITED EXTENT WITH THE DEMANDS OF LIFE. BECAUSE OF THEIR STRONG DEPENDENCY NEEDS, MOST CANNOT LIVE INDEPENDENTLY. MANY MENTAL HEALTH PROFESSIONALS ARE NOW RECOGNIZING THAT A NUMBER OF SEVERELY DISABLED PATIENTS CAN SURVIVE AND HAVE THEIR BASIC NEEDS MET ONLY IF THEY HAVE A SUFFICIENTLY STRUCTURED COMMUNITY FACILITY OR OTHER MECHANISM THAT PROVIDES SUPPORT. BUT THIS KIND OF SUPPORT IS NOT READILY AVAILABLE IN ALL COMMUNITIES.

ALTHOUGH SHELTERS SAVE LIVES, THEY DO NOT PROVIDE THE KIND OF ASSISTANCE THESE MENTALLY ILL INDIVIDUALS NEED. THE SHELTER APPROACH, ALTHOUGH NECESSARY AS A STOPGAP MEASURE, DOES NOT ADDRESS THE BASIC PROBLEMS OF THE HOMELESS MENTALLY ILL. VITAL COMMUNITY SERVICES ARE NECESSARY, AS ARE CHANGES IN THE LEGAL SYSTEM THAT WILL FACILITATE INVOLUNTARY TREATMENT.

CERTAINLY, ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES HAVE ALSO CONTRIBUTED TO THE HOMELESS PROBLEM. WHEN PERSONS WHO ARE MARGINALLY EMPLOYED LOSE THEIR JOBS, THEY ARE OFTEN LEFT WITH FEW ALTERNATIVES FOR SHELTER. HOWEVER, THIS KIND OF HOMELESSNESS IS MOST OFTEN TRANSITIONAL--WITH THESE FAMILIES NEEDING A LITTLE ASSISTANCE UNTIL THEY CAN GET BACK ON THEIR FEET. THE PHONOMENON OF MORE CHILDREN IN SHELTERS IS THE RESULT OF THIS HOMELESSNESS.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THERE SHOULD BE MORE PROGRAMS TO DEAL WITH THIS KIND OF HOMELESSNESS. TODAY WE WILL HEAR FROM A YOUNG MAN, TREVOR FERRELL, WHO TOOK IT UPON HIMSELF TO OPEN A SHELTER TO ASSIST THESE TRANSITIONAL HOMELESS. MEN, WOMEN AND CHILDREN MAY LIVE AT TREVOR'S PLACE FOR A PERIOD OF THREE TO TEN MONTHS. DURING THAT TIME THEY RECEIVE COUNSELING AND OTHER ASSISTANCE TO GET THEM BACK ON THEIR FEET. ALTHOUGH NOT THE ANSWER FOR ALL THE HOMELESS, ESPECIALLY THE MENTALLY ILL, ALCOHOLICS OR DRUG ADDICTS, TREVOR'S PLACE IS THE KIND OF ORGANIZATION WHICH PROVIDES NEEDED HELP TO PEOPLE WHO SUFFER TEMPORARY SETBACKS.

THE ANSWER TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE HOMELESS IS CERTAINLY NOT ANOTHER HUGE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY. WITH SUCH A HETEROGENUS POPULATION WITH COMPLEX AND OFTEN INTRACTABLE PROBLEMS, THE SOLUTIONS ARE NOT SIMPLE. I BELIEVE THAT THE PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS, WITH THE HELP OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE FUNDING, ARE MUCH MORE RESPONSIVE TO THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS PERSONS THAN A HUGE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY. EACH HOMELESS PERSON HAS PROBLEMS WHICH ARE PARTICULAR TO THEM WHICH ARE BEST DEALT WITH ON A PERSONAL AND INDIVIDUAL LEVEL.

ALTHOUGH THE PRIVATE SECTOR IS OFTEN BETTER SUITED TO RESPOND TO THE NEEDS OF THE HOMELESS, IT IS CLEAR THAT THERE IS AN IMPORTANT ROLE FOR ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MAINTAINS A NUMBER OF PROGRAMS WHICH PROVIDE FUNDING AND RESOURCES TO BOTH INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS ASSISTING THE HOMELESS. TODAY WE WILL HEAR FROM USDA ASSISTANT SECRETARY JOHN

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BODE ON THE DIFFERE. FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AVAILABLE TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE HUNGRY AND HOMELESS.

IN ADDITION, BECAUSE OF THE NUMEROUS FEDERAL AGENCIES INVOLVED IN SOME WAY IN HELPING TO ALLEVIATE THIS PROBLEM, IN 1983 FORMER SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES SECRETARY MARGARET HECKLER ESTABLISHED THE FEDERAL INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE ON FOOD AND SHELTER FOR THE HOMELESS. THIS TASK FORCE HAS BEEN WORKING TO CUT BUREAUCRATIC RED TAPE AND ACT AS A KEY CONTACT BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN PROVIDING FEDERAL BUILDINGS TO SHELTER THE HOMELESS OR AVAILABLE FOOD TO FEED THE HUNGRY. WE ARE EAGER TO LEARN OF THE SPECIFICS OF THEIR RECOMMENDATIONS.

FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL AND PRIVATE EFFORTS CAN BE IMPROVED, WITHOUT QUESTION. BUT, WE MUST MAKE SURE THAT WE BEGIN TO ADDRESS THE VERY COMPLEX ROOT CAUSES OF THIS PROBLEM. THEY ARE ROOTED IN VAST SOCIO-ECONOMIC UPHEAVALS, ILL-CONCEIVED REFORMS, AND INSTITUTIONAL INERTIA THAT HAVE LITERALLY THROWN INTO THE STREETS PEOPLE WHO ARE IN NEED OF MEDICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT.

TO THAT END, MR. CHAIRMAN, I URGE THE COMMITTEE TO CONTINUE THESE HEARINGS AND HOLD AT LEAST ONE HEARING DEVOTED SPECIFICALLY AND EXCLUSIVELY TO THE PROBLEMS OF THE DEINSTITUTIONALIZED MENTALLY ILL.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 25, 1985]

**THE HOMELESS**

WHO ARE THEY?

Joe Fino, a drifter since he arrived in Los Angeles seeking better times.

# *Down and Out by Choice*

## Some Reject Aid in Favor of 'Freedom'

*First of three articles*

By Jay Mathews
Washington Post Staff Writer

PASADENA, Calif. — Icy winds were swirling along New York's East River last November when Joe Fino, a young Air Force veteran, left his $9-an-hour job as a stock clerk to seek his fortune in the softer breezes of California.

He blew his savings on a plane ticket and spent half of his remaining $30 for a taxi ride from the airport to downtown Los Angeles. He barely missed a passing grade on an oral examination for police recruits, failed at a few other job attempts and then found his energy flagging.

He has not had a regular job since, saying he has found it more convenient to move among a series of free public shelters scattered about the area than to apply for welfare. Fino has joined a group of people who have made much of urban America the focus of a problem that after two years of intense media and government attention still defies solution. The problem is homelessness.

For every social ill, there was once thought to be a government solution, and past administra-

See HOMELESS, A22, Col. 1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# The Down and Out: Choosing 'Freedom' Over Aid Programs



tions stepped off boldly to prove just that. But homelessness is different. It has become something of a metaphor for the clash that has occurred since 1981 between the Great Society and the Reagan revolution.

Homelessness has defied not just solution but also definition. In the process, the issue has revealed the prevailing American ambivalence toward federal government solutions to social problems.

Homelessness is a deeply personal problem for those on the streets. It is also an example of government in action—groping with good intentions but confounded by inadequate knowledge and conflicting theories about government's proper role.

Did government, through the economic policies of the Reagan administration, help increase the number of homeless people in America today? Can government, in the absence of solid information about the scope of the problem or its causes, solve the problem? Is there a problem?

Just the effort to count the homeless and get some fix on the source of their misery has generated enough paper, in the form of government reports and academic studies, to keep a trash can fire going for weeks. Most agree that Los Angeles, with an estimated 35,000 homeless, may have more street people than any other U.S. metropolitan area. But there is little agreement on how many there are nationwide, much less how to help them.

Last year's campaign debates over the issue have subsided, but in hundreds of cities nationwide the homeless are still a constant political irritant.

Homeless advocate Mitch Snyder's struggle to win federal money for an 800-bed shelter in the District of Columbia, although one of the more important and bitter confrontations, is only one of many. Los Angeles supervisors face an unexpected budget deficit because of new demands for general relief for the homeless. Austin, Tex., is embroiled in controversy over the Salvation Army's plan for a new 200-bed facility for transients on commercially fashionable Sixth Street. Many cities are anticipating a new round of demonstrations by street people creating makeshift homeless villages when winter winds

## Government Seems Powerless

—Congress, controlled in part by Democrats, and the Republican White House have appeared powerless to solve the problem, even in a time of rising employment and economic health. That may stem from several causes, the complexity of which have become clearer the more the issue has been studied.

The federal effort to count the homeless, or at least provide a more verifiable estimate than the 2 million figure often used in stories about homelessness, has produced such a divisive political and legal donnybrook that all professional efforts to count the homeless have ceased.

In the absence of useful statistics, legislators have been torn over how much to appropriate to try to help. Rep. Mary Rose Oakar (D-Ohio) became so frustrated over this debate last year that she picked a figure of $62 million for a proposed demonstration project for mentally ill homeless because it happened to match the amount the House had raised military aid to El Salvador that day.

Most homeless shelters are privately run, by churches or other charitable groups. Although much of their funding comes from federal and local governments, those who operate the shelters and many social welfare experts insist that only such private volunteers have sufficient desire, experience and flexibility to help people with so many difficult problems.

Many of the root causes of homelessness—such as mental illness, urban renewal and the sexual revolution—resist bureaucratic solution and are shunned by politicians as being too difficult or delicate to address.

Interviews with homeless people indicate that many have rejected the government programs available to them and have chosen to move from shelter to street to shelter as the simplest approach to their problems. Although often miserable, they express a desire to extricate themselves with as little outside help and guidance as possible.

President Reagan was ridiculed early last year when he said many people are homeless "by choice." But the homeless do make choices, although often they must choose between unattractive alternatives, such as welfare or charity, and sometimes make decisions that seem rational only to them.

Isaac Rim Jr., 33, a former $4.50-an-hour nurse's aide, said he has been on the streets 11 years. Then, he said simply,

Rim stopped briefly as he headed toward a church-run library for derelicts in downtown Los Angeles, a copy of "The Science of the Mind" by Ernest Holmes under one arm. "I got my freedom," he said. "I got my independence. I work when I want to work.

## A Shifting Population

Nearly every study done in the last two years has suggested that for most people, homelessness is a temporary condition. Of the 20 homeless individuals interviewed at length in and near Pasadena's Depot, a barren shelter in the basement of a local church, only seven might be considered likely candidates for the semi-permanent underclass of derelicts—the alcoholics, mentally ill and illegal immigrants who have always lived on the edge of American society.

If most of these 20 did not seem to be permanently homeless, neither was a night in a shelter a new experience for them. For as many different reasons as they had different names, parents, family ties and talents, the people passing through the Depot had decided, with government programs available in nearly every case, to suffer the discomfort of life on the street.

"My big problem is I can't stay in one place for long.

I get bored and I want to see something else," said Richard Brightman, 45, a carpenter and horse handler who had arrived from Las Vegas two weeks before.

"I knew it was going to be temporary for me. I didn't feel no remorse, no regret, no dissatisfaction," said Michael Gunther, 33, who said his time at the shelter helped him prepare for his electrical engineering exams at Pasadena Community College. A misunderstanding, he said, had forced him out of his room at a friend's house. He needed a bed only briefly before finding another cheap rental. "I'm a man. I'm going to take care of myself one way or another."

One shelter veteran in downtown Los Angeles took this attitude to its light-hearted, or insane, extremes. "I don't have to be here. This is just a vacation for me."

Nearly every expert on the homeless assumes, with little hard data, that the current mass of homeless people is on average younger and includes a larger proportion of women and minorities than the skid row population of 20 years ago. Many experts have suggested that the latest people on the streets are different because they are victims of new social forces and thus require more and better government services than have been provided to derelicts in the past.

"Whether the homeless person is someone recently unemployed, someone existing on inadequate public assistance or SSI [Supplemental Security Income] benefits, someone who is mentally or emotionally impaired, it all comes back to economics," Katharine W. LeVeque, president of the Greater Baltimore Shelter Network, told a congressional hearing. "The greed and insensitivity of those who control our economic lives are responsible."

## Searching for Reasons

Some experts argue that the new homeless are the result of Reagan's budget cuts or the shift from smokestack to electronics industries and are helpless.

Los Angeles Deputy Mayor Grace Davis, on the other hand, said she believes that her city has become attractive to the homeless because "we have a more generous welfare system than in other states."

Vicki Baggette of the United Way Inc. office here said charity workers think the growing numbers of homeless appearing at shelters may have as much to do with publicity, attracting people who would have found shelter elsewhere, as with any increased economic distress.

Many homeless people blame their troubles on themselves.

"I don't manage money too well, put my priorities in the proper order," said Jerome Brown, a messenger and accounting clerk who does temporary office work. When the flu kept him home one week, he found that he was left with too little savings to pay the rent. The money had gone "in the streets . . . just having fun, having a good time . . . entertaining women, keeping up with my buddies . . . . If I'm making $960 a month, I usually spend at least $250 on marijuana."

Some analysts think the unpredictable nature of comments from the homeless may have kept many advocates of the homeless from probing the ideas and needs of their derelict constituents as closely as they should, and help explain the confusion over how the government can best help.

Anna Kondratas, who recently completed a long report on homelessness for the Heritage Foundation, said she found two distinct groups of homeless advocates: individuals who have been working on skid row for years and "do not see it as a political thing," and "highly motivated activists," more recently arrived, who have taken up the cause of the homeless and "put it in the context of their long-held political beliefs."

The feeling persists, among some experts as well as the homeless themselves, that many derelicts appearing at local shelters are beyond help. For one thing, the federal courts have ruled that harmless individuals, no matter how self-deluded, may refuse government help, counseling and hospitalization if they choose.

For another, existing shelters, despite the meager federal and private funds they receive, seem to have provided enough of a refuge to discourage some homeless from seeking further help or training. A UCLA research team, for instance, found that most of a group of 61 homeless men it interviewed rated their food, sleeping, shelter, safety, hygiene and clothing as adequate, even though they all said they disliked life on the streets.

The older, more self-sufficient homeless who see shelters as temporary expedients complain in particular about other derelicts who seem too comfortable with their lot. Ed Simmons, a 56-year-old former sales executive who says he once made $[illegible] a year, was waiting for an appointment with a state employment counselor when he pointed out a stocky Depot resident, a veteran of several other shelters.

"He doesn't want to work," Simmons said, "and he's taking everything he can get, any way that he can get it. And he's doing just fine. He's doing much better than I am."

Brightman, annoyed at being without his carpentry tools, said, "I notice there's a lot of these people that don't really care. They just take advantage of every situation, something they get for nothing."

"Many of them have self-destructive tendencies, like I have," said Mahei Saeed, 54, a former teletype operator. "There is bad management, because I know people who just splurge their money . . . . My feeling is, the only thing to be done about the homeless situation is to reach these people before they become unreachable, because these people who've been out on their own for two or three months, for five months, they are far gone, we cannot reach them."

*Special correspondent Katharine Macdonald contributed to this report.*

*NEXT: Counting the homeless.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Richard Brightman: Likes the Freedom of the Road

Richard Brightman, a tall, itinerant carpenter distinguished by his mustache and oak-leaf-cluster cap, has spent much of his 45 years on the move, and he does not plan to stop.

Smiling at many of his memories, he traced his route through dozens of jobs, three marriages, three children and countless bus and plane trips that brought him, somewhat annoyed at a bit of bad luck, to the Depot.

"I really don't like handouts any more than I have to," he said, but he had left his tools with his estranged wife in Ocala, Fla. He said he expected to find a menial job soon, like the junkyard and dishwashing work he had recently left in Tucson.

Life on the road can be lonely, he said, but he likes the freedom. "If I decide, like now, I can go up to San Francisco, go up, pack my things up and hit the road."

He was born in Trenton, N.J., and, at age 5, spent nine months in a county home when his parents divorced. He dropped out of high school in his junior year and enlisted in the Air Force at 17. He was discharged after 18 months when he went AWOL to see a woman: "Discipline—that was one of my biggest problems, having to be a certain place at a certain time."

But he said he has always supported himself and been jailed only once, a weekend sentence for drunken driving in Oklahoma.

He is an avid sightseer, with eclectic tastes. He rode the bus to Los Angeles in mid-January on his way to see the headquarters of the Worldwide Church of God, a Pasadena-based sect to which his third wife had belonged. The bus stopped in downtown Los Angeles, so he walked the streets for two days, looking around, and then walked the 10 miles to Pasadena.

He had $3 when he arrived, but other people on the street told him about the Depot. Arriving at a new town with no money "doesn't bother me," he said. "But I haven't really had this much of a problem getting established . . . . I'm a little disgusted right now."

BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS FOR THE WASHINGTON POST

Richard Brightman says a drifter's life can be lonely but he likes being able to pack up and hit the road.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Jerome Brown: Riding Out the Hard Times on His Own

At 32, Jerome Brown is outgoing and ready for fun, but often in his life something has interfered.

In 1979, while he was a bank clerk in Long Beach, Calif., he came into some money. He bought a Corvette Stingray, suitable clothes and jewelry and was enjoying the Manhattan night life when police arrested him on a charge of embezzling $165,600 from his bank.

Early this year, after spending 10 months in prison and returning to fairly steady work as a temporary office clerk and messenger, he was making as much as $1,000 a month and pursuing an active social life in Los Angeles. But flu put him out of work with no savings and, eventually, no money for his $73-a-week room at the Cecil Hotel.

He applied for unemployment, but the paper work would take time. He was annoyed that his sister and two brothers failed to offer him temporary lodging. "If I had a place like they had, I would have space," he said.

A resident of one of the downtown shelters he had tried told him about the gentler life in Pasadena's Depot. During one of the long bus rides he took so he could nap in a warm place, he headed there.

Not that Brown is comfortable asking favors. He said he would have voted for President Reagan last year out of disgust with the local welfare system. "I know girls that I went to high school with that have been on the county for 16 straight years. They just retired. So that's why I don't like it."

He said he stole the money back in 1979 (an accomplice still at large has most of it, he says) because he believed that his supervisors were not rewarding his skill and energy. Now he prefers to ride out the hard times on his own:

"It's necessary for me to be able to say to myself when I do get back to the plateau that I once was—sharp car, nice cloth[illegible]—I will know I've managed."

BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS FOR THE WASHINGTON POST

Jerome Brown, right, walking with companion Benjamin Colins, says he wants to survive on his own.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 26, 1985]

# Head-Counting Efforts Complicated by Politics

## *HUD's Lower Estimate Creates Uproar*

*Second of three articles*

By Jay Mathews
Washington Post Staff Writer

Charles Cowan, a U.S. Census Bureau statistician with a fertile imagination, knows the idea sounds odd, but he insists that he can count homeless people the way game wardens count fish or deer.

Under a sophisticated estimation procedure called "capture-recapture," derelicts on skid row should act like trout in a mountain lake, moving at random in a way that allows their total number to be derived from two small samples. Cowan once almost won a federal grant to try the trick in downtown Columbus, Ohio, but the expensive clerical costs discouraged sponsors.

It was one more false start in a frustrating, sometimes almost comic, two-year struggle to find a way to count the homeless, whose numbers remain a mystery even while the government spends $70 million a year to ease their plight. The desire to wrap a phenomenon both evident and elusive into a manageable package has been key to the federal effort to help the homeless and provided the root cause of the effort's disarray.

The most painstaking effort to count homeless people, a $138,000 Housing and Urban Development Department study conducted last year, has taken such a political beating that the federal government appears to have given up trying to define the problem.

"I haven't seen any serious research efforts since," said Anna Kondratas, a Heritage Foundation analyst who recently completed a major review of literature about the homeless.

The HUD study estimated the number of homeless nationwide at

**THE HOMELESS**

HOW MANY?

no more than 350,000—and the federal agency went to great lengths to buttress that number from all sides. But the political and legal uproar it created seems to prove that the issue is so politically charged that even a careful attempt to measure the problem is unlikely to be accepted.

Politicians have exploded in anger at the frustrating search for a number to quantify the problem. "The real question gets down to—not whether the numbers . . . are 300,000 or 3 million—the real

See HOMELESS, A10, Col. 1

HOMELESS, From A1

question is, what are we going to do about it," Rep. Bruce F. Vento (D-Minn.) exclaimed at a congressional hearing last year.

Rep. John Patrick Hiler (R-Ind.) registered a mild dissent during the same meeting. "Without having at least some idea of what numbers might be, it is difficult to determine how much money should be spent."

Hiler neatly framed the dilemma that has confronted federal officials since homelessness became large enough in the public mind to demand a response. And the government's one serious effort to count the homeless illustrates the maddening course that federal policy-making has followed since then.

Until early 1984, when HUD began to try to count

the homeless, newspaper editorialists and political speech writers had generally used an estimate of 2 million people. The source of this number was the Community for Creative Non-Violence in Washington. Mitch Snyder, the group's best-known member, has become a vocal advocate nationally for the homeless.

The group has said that its estimate was based on "information received from more than 100 agencies and organizations in 25 cities and states," but it has resisted requests for more detailed background. Even Snyder has ridiculed the number, calling his and other estimates "meaningless."

"We have tried to satisfy your gnawing curiosity for a number because we are Americans with western little minds that have to quantify everything in sight, whether we can or not," he told one congressional hearing.

Still, the 2 million figure became a bench mark against which other numbers were compared.

## HUD Team Checks 2 Million Estimate

In 1983 HUD Secretary Samuel R. Pierce Jr., faced with many requests for more information on homelessness, ordered a study by the department's office of policy development and research. This team of statisticians and survey analysts began to check Snyder's 2 million estimate. They approached the problem from several directions, as if they were trapping a rare species of antelope.

Jack Underhill, 53, an analyst long attuned to the mysteries of statistics, had been with HUD for 20 years, much of that time spent tracking the development of new towns. In the homeless survey, he was assigned to the group canvassing 60 metropolitan areas by telephone. They included major cities such as Los Angeles and New York where derelicts were known to congregate, as well as smaller cities—Annapolis, Md., Danville, Va., and Lompoc, Calif.—where the problem might not be so noticeable.

The HUD team made more than 500 calls to local politicians, housing authorities, homeless advocates, charity representatives and university researchers. Each estimate of the number of homeless in the area on an average winter night was given a statistical weight. A guess by a city council member who had never visited a shelter would have less impact on the final figure than a charity worker's calculation based on an actual head count of shelter residents and street-corner derelicts.

Some staff members followed up the telephone calls with local visits. Underhill stopped in Denver, Seattle, Salt Lake City and Cleveland as well as Los Angeles.

In Los Angeles, Underhill found that one local study had been completed. In February, Marge Nichols, research director for United Way in Los Angeles, had polled a group of local experts to reach an estimate of 24,928 homeless for Los Angeles County. She noted that a local hot line received 12,214 emergency shelter requests in 1983, a sign of the problem's severity even if one case might stimulate more than one call.

Other local experts were less sure. Los Angeles Deputy Mayor Grace Davis discounted one estimate of 30,000 homeless in Los Angeles. "If we had that many," she said, "they'd be wall-to-wall on the streets." Police squads dispatched to count people sleeping in the open one night last January found only 700 in the whole city, to add to the city's overnight shelter population of about 2,000.

Underhill personally learned the weaknesses of such counts during his regular 6 a.m. jogs in the streets near his Wilshire Boulevard Hotel. He found four parked cars with overnight occupants still asleep, the homeless of the highway generation difficult to detect in the dark.

But armed with interviews with more than 40 shelter providers and officials throughout the area and having visited several shelters, Underhill came up with an estimate for Los Angeles of 31,300 to 33,800. He considered it fair and defensible.

Armed with similarly diverse expert opinion from the 60 rated cities, the HUD team made several statistical

Mitch Snyder termed the HUD report on the number of homeless "the most sloppy, imprecise, unprofessional, inaccurate and misleading 'study' that I have ever seen."

BY MOLLY RILEY
FOR THE WASHINGTON POST

adjustments to its raw data to account for all cities and produced an estimate of the number of homeless people in urban America: 210,000.

There was more to do, however.

HUD had to add an estimate for rural areas, ultimately settling on 44,000. That meant an estimated national total of 254,000 homeless people.

HUD then paid a survey research firm, Westat Inc., $32,000 to survey shelter operators throughout the country and determine their capacities, the kind of people they served and their own estimates of the number of homeless in their areas. Working from 25 booths on the first floor of the firm's white four-story building in Rockville, the Westat interviewers reached 184 shelter officials. Their estimates of total homeless in shelters and out, statistically adjusted as the local expert estimates had been, produced another total: 353,000 homeless.

Kathleen Peroff, who headed the HUD team, acknowledged that shelter providers might be tempted to inflate their estimates to ensure future funding but insisted that they are one of the best sources available. Stephen K. Dietz, the Westat vice president, said his interviewers told him the shelter officials were so careful that they often excused themselves from the telephone to check records before answering some of the 23 questions read to them.

Still the search for the most accurate number continued. HUD team members searched newspapers and magazines, research studies and congressional reports for the highest recent estimates for homelessness in each locality. Taking published estimates for homeless in cities across the country produced the highest of the national homelessness totals in the study: 586,000.

Peroff said she realized at the time that accepting newspaper estimates was "pretty crazy," but she wanted to make a point. "What we were trying to do is say, if we take the highest numbers that have ever been published, we still don't get 2 million."

Two other estimates were produced, based on other calculations. These put the number of homeless at 192,000 or 298,000.

The fragile nature of these careful estimates became apparent at one congressional hearing when the HUD team discovered that someone had punched the wrong button on the calculator, which changed one estimate by 31,000.

With totals ranging from 192,000 to 586,000, HUD then concluded that "as best as can be determined from all available data, the most reliable range is 250,000 to 350,000 homeless persons."

## Methodology Remains Controversial

The search, apparently, was over. But the team's methodology remains controversial. Snyder, who has accused Peroff of criminal perjury and filed suit against HUD to withdraw the report, called it "the most sloppy, imprecise, unprofessional, inaccurate and misleading 'study' that I have ever seen" and said it was produced to suit the Reagan White House's budget-cutting policies. He also produced a former Westat interviewer who cited inconsistencies in data collected from shelter operators in the same area.

Kondratas, in preparing her Heritage Foundation report, noted how little information Snyder had presented about his methodology and how some of the homeless estimates he provided seemed to back up HUD's work.

Other professional researchers, like Richard Ropers of the UCLA School of Public Health, say the 2 million estimate may be a fair approximation of the number of Americans who find themselves without shelter at some point during a year.

The HUD team had anticipated criticism. Its members had worked in Washington long enough to know that, with a presidential campaign under way, and newspapers routinely using Snyder's estimate of 2 million homeless, their new number could cause an uproar. "People were going to kill us," one official warned.

The team went over its figures several times, but came up the same result. One team member momentarily thought of the possibility of fiddling with the methodology to make the totals seems higher, but gave it up as senseless and dishonest. "We decided that's the way it is," the researcher said.

When the Federal Emergency Management Agency tried to determine how much homelessness had increased this year, it avoided using the HUD figures as a base line—and used no base line at all. "We count more and more homeless people every year," it concluded, "but they still remain largely uncountable."

*Special correspondent Katharine Macdonald contributed to this report.*

*NEXT: Trying to help*

Los Angeles Police counts of homeless people sleeping in the open had weaknesses, HUD analyst Jack Underhill learned on his morning jogs, when he saw people sleeping in parked automobiles.

BY LARRY MOORE
THE WASHINGTON POST

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Ricardo Morales: 'How Far Down Can a Man Go?'

Of all the homeless people to gather at the Pasadena shelter called the Depot one night last January, only one could trace his troubles to federal budget cuts. Ricardo Morales, a lively and articulate community counselor, has never recovered from accelerating disenchantment with the war on poverty.

Born in New York's Spanish Harlem in 1933, Morales lived in a Catholic boys home from age 6 to 14 because his seaman father and his asthmatic mother could not care for him. He remembers watching from the street as she waved from her sanitorium window.

BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS FOR THE WASHINGTON POST

**Ricardo Morales at the Depot in Pasadena: "I blame the president directly for his cuts."**

He recalls the thrill of school life full of music, religion and sports. His appearance in a 1946 high school baseball championship made him, he said, "the first black to play in Yankee Stadium, no, I mean the Polo Grounds."

He spent three years in the Army: On the way south to Fort Bragg, the officers ordered all the blacks to the back of the train once it crossed the Potomac River. He spent most of his military career on the boxing team and continued in the ring after his discharge. A severely broken nose in 1958 ended that career, but he had other talents.

He could organize anything. He was an optimist who found opportunities where there seemed to be none. From boxing and music promotion he moved to community organizing and counseling, earning as much as $24,000 a year helping drug addicts and ex-convicts in Orange County, Calif., in 1974.

He has been married three times and has three children. His second wife, with family ties to California, inspired his first move to the state. But when she abandoned Morales and their 9-year-old son in 1975, he was forced to move to Puerto Rico. There his parents could help watch the boy, although work in his field was hard to find.

In December he received what he thought was a job offer from a community organization in East Los Angeles. When he arrived Jan. 7, the organizer was out of town and did not return until Morales was down to his last dollar. The man dismissed him with a curt, "I don't owe nothing to nobody," and Morales was on the streets.

Other job offers evaporated, he said, because he had no fixed address. A job placement counselor in Pasadena told him about the Depot, the barren shelter that caused him to wonder, "How far down can a man go?" A friendly man in the neighborhood offered to share his apartment and then he found that he could afford his own, at least temporarily, through part-time work as a warehouseman, a telephone solicitor and a recreation leader. But the counseling jobs he wanted seemed gone.

"I blame the president directly for his cuts," Morales said. "He may be considered the greatest president the states have ever had . . . but I cannot work because he has literally cut out all the sources of income for sociologists and social workers."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## The Jimenez Brothers: 'We'll Go Somewhere Else'

Eduardo Jimenez, 22, always smiling, not always comprehending, and his brother Juan, 19, quick and bright, crossed the Mexican border near Yuma, Ariz., in mid-1982. They have been on the run ever since, riding the rails in search of fun, adventure and money.

They exude charm, they are willing to work, and they have rarely lacked for kindness from strangers. They would not have had to resort to spending a few nights in the Depot if they hadn't forgotten their manners and smuggled some alcohol into the home of the "Christian family" in Los Angeles where they were staying.

"They didn't want anybody to drink," said Juan, smiling. Eduardo hands a reporter a small book of Bible verses in English and tries to follow the conversation. He did not bother to take language classes with his brother when they arrived, so Juan has become his interpreter.

Despite the hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens thought to be living in Los Angeles, relatively few are found in homeless shelters. HUD investigator Jack Underhill said they appear to find space by "doubling up" with other Latino families, although this "may have a bumping effect on other people."

The Jimenez brothers have worked as carpenters, gardeners and farm hands. They have traveled to Fresno, San Bernadino, Riverside and Pomona. In their first six months, they found good jobs at a plastic tubing plant and sent $1,200 home to their parents on the farm in Guadalajara.

Good jobs have been harder to find since. Eduardo was caught and deported once but crossed the border again within five days. Churches have helped them. One church worker directed them to the Depot when they lost their place to stay. "I feel bad" about using a shelter, Juan said, "but at the same time I don't rip off anybody or take anything . . . . We got a couple more days here, then we'll go somewhere else."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 27, 1985]

# Defeat of Good Intentions

## *Multimillion-Dollar Government Efforts Mired in Political Controversy, Bureaucracy*

*Last of three articles*

By Jay Mathews
Washington Post Staff Writer

PASADENA, Calif.—Kinney and Crescencia Owens, grimy and disheartened from too many nights in their station wagon, stopped at the Depot shelter here last winter hoping just to use the shower. They were refused.

"We thought somebody else could use the bed 'cause we had the car, and warm clothes and warm blankets," said Crescencia, pushing back her long brown hair. Even though the little 20-bed shelter was often overbooked, the rule was that only overnight guests could use the shower, so the Owenses reluctantly moved in, unhappy victims of one more bureaucratic complication in the national effort to help the homeless.

Through more than two years and the expenditure of $210 million

**THE HOMELESS**
WHO'S HELPING?

in federal dollars, shelter operators, members of Congress, homeless advocates and agency officials have been trying to ease the pain and discomfort of hundreds of thousands of derelicts. But that effort is now so embroiled in political controversy, number-one rules and contradictory programs that the practical problems of individual homeless people seem to have receded into the background.

Faced with reports of people sleeping under bridges and in cars and a rising influx at existing shelters, Congress created the Emergency Food and Shelter Program in March 1983. It provided money for feeding and housing derelicts in mostly privately run shelters while federal departments and committees worked out ways to address the root causes of the perceived spurt in homelessness.

The instinct of government, even under a president distrustful of social engineering, was to act, but today the effort appears mired in confusion over what forces have caused homelessness and whether any of them are within the government's power. Before taking its summer recess, the House approved a $70

See HOMELESS, A6, Col. 1

# Government Efforts Mired In Confusion

HOMELESS, From A1

million appropriation for emergency food and shelter programs in fiscal 1986, carrying over the amount spent by the Federal Emergency Management Agency the previous year.

"It's best to take their money but not take their systems," said Cindy Abbott, director of the Depot shelter, which has some federal support. Even the federal requirements for accepting funds often "miss the point of what we're doing" and volunteers are "less likely to get burned out" than federal workers, she said. Her experience, and the government's failure to do much more than try to keep the homeless sheltered and fed, has appeared to add strength to the many voices arguing that government should curb its instinct to act in such cases.

Many homeless people who are mentally ill appear determined to reject whatever institutions and programs are available to them. Popular efforts to help some poor people by rebuilding downtown neighborhoods have put many other poor people on the streets. Family disputes, the cause of homelessness for many, resist political solution. Welfare officials' efforts to discourage cheating have led thousands of homeless to shun public relief and shelter and choose less-regulated, if often overcrowded, private shelters like the Depot here in this Los Angeles suburb.

The problems the homeless most often mention have to do with the running of shelters, annoyances like the no drop-in showers rules or a lack of telephones, and must be handled by shelter supervisors.

Adding to the accumulating obstacles to help for the homeless is the old story of neighborhood resistance. In scores of communities across the country plans for new shelters or training facilities are being opposed by businessmen and residents who feel that the presence of ill-kept poor people, many of them alcoholic and mentally ill, will drive away customers and lower real estate values.

Democrats have blamed homelessness on a Republican administration in Washington that has allowed high unemployment to fight inflation and encouraged welfare cuts. But housing experts say the roots of homelessness are often far less political and less susceptible to political solution.

In several local communities, for example, leading Democrats as well as Republicans have applauded the downtown revitalization projects that have replaced thousands of inexpensive rented rooms with office buildings and glittery hotels. Private shelters like Pasadena's Depot or downtown Los Angeles' Midnight Mission have had to absorb the displaced persons who once lived in cheap, $6-a-night residential hotels, sometimes called SROs (single room occupancy.) New York's supply of such hotel rooms dropped from 50,000 to 19,619 in six years. San Francisco lost 10,000 rooms in the 1970s; Los Angeles lost 7,000.

Little has been done to replace this housing and what is left is not good.

"There is a radiator in my room. It has never been on," James Simpson, a Los Angeles welfare recipient assigned to the Russ Hotel, said in a court declaration filed in

59-645 O - 86 - 4

December. I asked the guy at the desk to turn on the heat when it got real cold. He just looked at me."

The family problems that lead to homelessness are also rarely fit for use as fodder for political debate. Kinney and Crescencia Owens, the couple who wanted to take showers at the Depot, are one example. They slept in their creaking station wagon in a church parking lot not far from the shelter. They were in the streets because Crescencia's father had ejected them from his spacious house in Fontana, 50 miles to the east.

Kinney said he had lost his $40,000-a-year job as a sound technician after a dispute over an unpaid bill reached his studio's management office. When he and Crescencia separated briefly, a man she dated beat her so badly that she had to be hospitalized. Kinney helped nurse his wife back to health, but her father and sister tired of having them in the house. They lived in their car and tried to make a living selling small items at swap meets and flea markets.

When such family difficulties result in severe mental illness, policy makers in Washington regard the discussion. Both liberals and conservatives have recommended improving community mental health care facilities, although who would pay for this is not clear. But if there were money to build a new mental health clinic next to the Depot, it still might not help someone like Larry Ingle, an independent-minded American University dropout.

By his own count, Ingle has been committed four times for schizophrenia. The last and longest hospitalization, eight months, was nine years ago. Since then he has wandered about, arriving in California in October to look for work or schooling.

"I had to do something drastic," said Ingle, 34, a tall, slim figure dressed in a long, dark winter coat and chewing on a piece of bread at Pershing's soup kitchen. "My family, they mean well, but they're not helping me. They tell me they should protect me. But, you know, I have to get out and make it on my own."

Dr. Ellen L. Bassuk, a Boston psychiatrist, found a 50 percent incidence of diagnosable mental illness among the residents of a large Boston shelter in 1984. Her case study of homeless families indicates that more than 80 percent of the mothers suffer from psychiatric ills.

Other researchers have challenged these findings. Rich Jones, a child psychologist living on the streets for about seven years, [illegible] Richard Keppel of UCLA, whose own samples of homeless men show only about 20 percent with a history of mental illness.

But no matter how many street people have emotional problems, whether they can be forced to seek help if they don't appear to want it remains a thorny issue. The federal courts have decreed that the homeless mentally ill have a right to the independence that is their own expressed goal.

Otis McLaughlin stopped at the Depot and proclaimed himself a fugitive from Eureka, Calif., where he said a "personal war" against "folks from out of state" was under way, part of a plot by Canada to take over the United States. He had apparently harmed no one in his journey. His words were harsh and disturbing and he presented an odd picture in long coat, tennis shoes and graying crew cut.

Ten years ago, in the case of *O'Connor v. Donaldson*, Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart anticipated the situation of people like McLaughlin by proclaiming a constitutional "right to liberty" for the emotionally disturbed. "May the state force in the harmless mentally ill [illegible] to save [illegible] from [illegible] to those whose ways are different? One might as well ask if the state [illegible] public interest could [illegible] all who are physically [illegible] or socially eccentric."

[illegible] many homeless, the welfare system seems to offer [illegible] option than a mental health clinic. Los Angeles County, under its general relief program, will give a single person with no [illegible] means of support $228 a month, plus food stamps, bus tokens and free care at the county hospital. To earn that [illegible] Garfield can spend [illegible] cleaning county parks and hospitals or doing [illegible] public service work. He must [illegible] a week and visit at least 20 prospective employers each month.

Those who do not comply are [illegible] for at least two months before

they can apply again. Carol Matsui, special assistant to the director of county public social services, estimates that about 2,000 of the nearly 36,000 on general relief are forced off the rolls each month for disobeying the rules. Rogers insists that the number is much higher. "The general relief system and the whole welfare system throws up a whole lot of obstacles to needy people."

The Owenses did not apply for general relief because they would have been forced to sell their car, their only source of mobility and guaranteed shelter in an uncertain world.

The reluctance to deal with the welfare system persists even though, according to a recent county analysis of federal data, general relief grants in Los Angeles are larger than in most other cities and states. The District of Columbia provides only $206 in monthly general public assistance to indigents who can prove medical disability. Healthy applicants get nothing. General relief in Montgomery County pays a maximum of $235.50 a month. Fairfax County pays $222 a month, but for only three months.

When asked what they would like improved, homeless people often mention inadequate services at the shelters they frequent. Many complain that they cannot communicate with the outside world—the potential employers, caseworkers, family and friends who might help them. One pay telephone serves Pasadena's Union Station soup kitchen, where homeless people congregate during the day. There are no phones they can use in the overnight shelter, and they are only allowed to be there from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m., when calls are inconvenient.

Jerome Brown, an unemployed office clerk and messenger, said, "I could have worked today if I was in someplace stable, someplace where I could call them, they could call me." The pay phone at Pasadena's soup kitchen was "very inconvenient," he said. Kinney Owens said he would like to stay in touch with his union about new jobs, but "we have no telephone in the car. And when you've got to put 45 to 50 cents per call several times a day, it can add up."

Some shelters are trying to respond to such complaints. A recent city-neighborhood agreement in Pasadena, now challenged in court, would allow the construction of a new 40-bed shelter with shower and phone privileges for homeless who don't want to stay. Bill Doulos, director of the Union Station soup kitchen, said he hopes the telephone company will be able to give him a special line that will permit local, but not long-distance, calls by derelicts seeking jobs and housing.

Most shelter providers approach the future with little more financial certainty than their homeless clients. Although the House passed the $70 million appropriation for fiscal 1988, the Senate must still take action. "I get a hundred calls a day from people all around the country asking what I've heard," said William J. Forbis, a United Way executive who staffs the Alexandria-based Emergency Food and Shelter Program that disperses homeless aid.

Congressional advocates for the homeless have said they would like to provide money for more community mental health programs for those with emotional problems, more job training for the unskilled, more efforts to save cheap housing downtown. But so little is known about how the homeless would respond to such programs, and there has been so much resistance to new homeless facilities or even to counting the homeless, that some experts wonder how much good the additional money will do.

"I think most of the homeless are unaware of what goes on in the political arena in their name," said Anna Kondratas, who recently wrote a report on homelessness for the Heritage Foundation. When more federal dollars are added, "at the margin, you get some more to use the system, . . . but homelessness can't be solved without the massive intervention of volunteers."

She added: "One couple operating a shelter told me what the people need is very tough love, and you can't get that from a federal program."

*Special correspondent Katharine Macdonald contributed to this report.*

## THE HOMELESS: WHO IS HELPING?

BY THE ASSOCIATED PRESS FOR THE WASHINGTON POST

Kinney and Crescencia Owens, above, with the station wagon that has been their home. James Ryan, left, helps others in his situation.

## The Owenses: 'A Chapter Out of Job'

Kinney Owens, 34, and his wife, Crescencia, 41, are friendly people who met on a Los Angeles bus, coming into each other's lives from very different directions. Crescencia's two marriages had failed; her five children were elsewhere. Kinney was a successful sound technician who had never been married.

Five years later they were living together in a parked station wagon, bound by ties of faith, love and tragedy that neither of them could have anticipated.

It began when a bill collector complained to Kinney's studio chief when he refused to pay for a lunch he had not ordered. The incident left a bad taste and led, he thinks, to his being laid off some months later.

They lost their apartment near the beach and moved in with Kinney's mother. The strain was too much, and they separated.

When a man Crescencia moved in with beat her severely, Kinney rushed back to take her to the hospital. Her shoulder and arm injuries took months to heal. They moved into her father's large house in Fontana, but the old man was in his 80s and Crescencia's other relatives resented her presence. Crescencia said she heard accusations that she was stealing from her father. Her sister helped her father get a court order throwing the Owenses out.

Their income from selling goods at swap meets was dwindling. Police were ejecting them from parks where they slept in their station wagon. They could not apply for welfare until they sold the vehicle, which would have robbed them of mobility.

A YMCA worker steered them to the Depot, and a nearby church let them use its parking lot while they looked for jobs.

Six months later, Kinney has begun working at a film-processing plant at about half his former $40,000 annual salary. They have found summer lodging in a friend's house but had to give up their dog.

Once they had "everything there was that we needed," Kinney said, but lately their lives seem "like a chapter out of Job."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# THE HOMELESS: WHO IS HELPING?

## James Ryan: Doing the Lord's Work

Like many of the temporary residents of the Depot, James Ryan, 42, lost a parent through death, disease or divorce early in life. But he exudes purpose and self-confidence like few of the rest. That was God's work, Ryan said.

His father died in World War II. His stepfather seemed to reject him. He quit school at 15, stole a few things and married a woman who was persistently unfaithful. He was discharged from the Army for heavy drinking. At age 25 he was sent to prison for three years for child-molesting.

He found life at the Florida state prison at Raiford "rather nice." He earned a high school credential and became a born-again Christian. But after his release his sexual and financial problems continued. In 1972 he left Florida for a life of warehouse jobs, Salvation Army beds, occasional preaching and big dreams. It is the life he still lives.

He said a Los Angeles psychiatrist paid by the Veterans Administration helped him put the child-molesting behind him in 1976. He failed to get a job as a marine diver, his fondest ambition, but that was because "the Lord . . . wanted me to study for the ministry, . . . so he couldn't bless me."

Ryan had some money from an unemployment check and might have found some lodging last January but felt driven by God to spend some nights at the Depot anyway.

Some people said he was taking advantage. In the six months since his Depot stay, he has lived at another Pasadena-area shelter, in a friend's car and in a downtown shelter called Transition House, where the staff tries to turn derelicts toward productive work during a 60-day stay.

But Ryan says he is doing the Lord's work, "working with people on the street, helping them to get their lives squared away."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RAYMOND L. FLYNN, MAYOR OF BOSTON, AND CHAIRMAN, TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

I AM PRIVILEGED TO APPEAR BEFORE THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER TODAY ON BEHALF OF THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS.

AS MY SUBMISSION* TO THE COMMITTEE INDICATES, MR. CHAIRMAN, TOO MANY PEOPLE IN AMERICA'S CITIES ARE HUNGRY. AND THEY ARE HUNGRY BECAUSE THIS NATION IS ABANDONING THOSE PROGRAMS THAT ENABLE US TO SUPPORT POOR AND WORKING FAMILIES IN THEIR PURSUIT OF AFFORDABLE FOOD AND SHELTER.

HUNGER IS A STEALTHY, SILENT ENEMY. IT GNAWS UNSEEN AT MILLIONS IN OUR CITIES, ITS PAIN CUTTING ACROSS LINES OF AGE, ETHNICITY AND FAMILY STRUCTURE. IT'S NOT JUST A PROBLEM FOR ELDERLY PEOPLE, THOUGH THE ELDERLY ARE HUNGRY.

AND IT IS NOT JUST A PROBLEM FOR POOR PEOPLE, THOUGH MILLIONS OF LOW INCOME CHILDREN AND ADULTS ARE GOING WITHOUT.

HUNGER IS AMERICA'S PROBLEM. AND THAT IS WHY WE APPEAL TO THE CONGRESS FOR LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT TO END IT.

MR. CHAIRMAN, IN JANUARY, AS HEAD OF THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS' TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS, I HAD THE SAD DUTY OF REPORTING THAT HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS WERE STILL ON THE

* THE GROWTH OF HUNGER, HOMELESSNESS AND POVERTY IN AMERICA'S CITIES IN 1985

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INCREASE IN AMERICA'S CITIES. IN 1985, THE DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE INCREASED IN ALL BUT ONE OF OUR TWENTY-FIVE TASK FORCE CITIES, AND IS EXPECTED TO INCREASE AGAIN IN ALL BUT THREE CITIES IN 1986. ON THE AVERAGE, 17 PERCENT OF THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE GOES UNMET. AT THE SAME TIME, CITY GOVERNMENTS ARE PROVIDING WHAT FUNDS THEY CAN TO EMERGENCY FOOD EFFORTS, ONLY TO FIND THAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAS ALREADY ROBBED THE PANTRY.

SIMILARLY THE DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER INCREASED IN ALL BUT THREE OF THE TASK FORCE CITIES IN 1985, BY AN AVERAGE OF 25 PERCENT, AND IS EXPECTED TO INCREASE IN ALL BUT THREE AGAIN THIS YEAR. IN 60 PERCENT OF THE CITIES, EMERGENCY SHELTERS CANNOT ACCOMMODATE ALL OF THE PEOPLE SEEKING HELP, AND IN OVER HALF OF THOSE CITIES, SHELTERS MUST ROUTINELY TURN PEOPLE AWAY.

WE FOUND THAT THE NATIONAL ECONOMIC RECOVERY HAS NOT LESSENED THE PROBLEMS OF HOMELESSNESS IN ANY OF THE CITIES AND THAT IT HAS EASED THE PROBLEMS OF HUNGER IN ONLY ONE. IN MORE THAN HALF OF THE SURVEY CITIES THE NUMBER OF POOR RESIDENTS INCREASED DURING 1985. ALL BUT THREE REPORTED THAT THE PROBLEMS OF THE "NEW POOR" HAVE CONTINUED.

FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN ARE HARD HIT BY THESE PROBLEMS. NINETY-TWO PERCENT OF THE CITIES REPORT THAT THE NUMBER OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN REQUESTING EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE INCREASED DURING

1985, ON AVERAGE BY 30 PERCENT. EIGHTY-FIVE PERCENT OF THE RESPONDING CITIES REPORTED A GROWING NUMBER OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN AMONG THEIR HOMELESS POPULATION.

THESE PROBLEMS ARE GNAWING AT THE FIBER OF AMERICAN CITIES. WE SEE GROWING NUMBERS OF WOMEN AND CHILDREN BEING PUSHED INTO POVERTY AND HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS BY A COMBINATION OF HIGH HOUSING COSTS, WIDESPREAD UNDEREMPLOYMENT AND THE REALITY OF THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS BEING KNOCKED OFF THE ELIGIBILITY LIST FOR VITAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

AS WE GATHER HERE TODAY, FARMERS ALL ACROSS AMERICA ARE LOOKING FORWARD TO PLANTING AND HARVESTING ANOTHER SEASON'S CROPS. BUT MANY OF THOSE FARMERS, AND THOSE OF US WHO DEPEND UPON THEM, MUST LOOK FORWARD WITH TREPIDATION, AFRAID OF A BITTER HARVEST OR NONE AT ALL -- BECAUSE THE FY 1987 FEDERAL BUDGET PROMISES FULL MISSILE SILOS, NOT FULL CORN SILOS.

WHILE WE WITNESS AN EIGHT PERCENT INCREASE IN MILITARY SPENDING (AFTER INFLATION), THE PROPOSED FY 1987 BUDGET WOULD CUT OVER ONE BILLION DOLLARS FROM NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. THE SCHOOL LUNCH AND BREAKFAST PROGRAM, THE CHILD CARE FOOD PROGRAM, THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM, THE TEMPORARY EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND THE EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM ARE ALL SLATED FOR CUTS, ELIMINATION OR CHANGES THAT WOULD MOVE US EVEN FURTHER AWAY FROM AN ADEQUATE -- NOT TO MENTION, COMPASSIONATE -- RESPONSE TO THE PAIN OF HUNGER.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WHEN IT COMES TO POVERTY IN AMERICA, THOSE AMERICANS FIRST ASKED TO BEAR THE BRUNT OF THE FEDERAL DEFICIT REDUCTION EFFORT ARE OFTEN WOMEN AND CHILDREN. CERTAINLY, THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT HAS GIVEN NEW MEANING TO THE PHRASE, "WOMEN AND CHILDREN FIRST".

THE PROPOSED 1987 FEDERAL BUDGET IS MORE DIRECT EVIDENCE OF THE TWO-TIERED SOCIETY THAT OUR NATIONAL LEADERSHIP IS CONSTRUCTING. ON THE TOP TIER, WE FIND A FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MORE CONCERNED WITH LOWERING CORPORATE TAX RATES AND INCREASING THE PROSPERITY OF THE WEALTHY, WHILE ON THE BOTTOM TIER, WE FIND FAMILIES STRUGGLING TO PUT FOOD ON THE TABLE. EVEN THOUGH THEY'RE EMPLOYED, THEY ARE OFTEN UNDEREMPLOYED IN JOBS THAT DON'T PAY ENOUGH TO KEEP PACE WITH THE SPIRALLING COST OF HOUSING AND OTHER PRESSING FAMILY NEEDS.

ON THE TOP TIER, THE WEALTHY HAVE THE LUXURY OF WORRYING ABOUT HOW FEDERAL PROGRAMS WILL AFFECT THE RATE OF INTEREST ON THEIR TRUST FUNDS. BUT ON THE BOTTOM TIER WE'RE CONFRONTED BY UNACCEPTABLE RATES OF POVERTY, OF HUNGER, AND OF INFANT MORTALITY -- ALL PROBLEMS EXACERBATED BY CUTS IN FEDERAL PROGRAMS.

WHILE EVERY CONSCIENTIOUS AMERICAN MUST BE CONCERNED ABOUT THE NATIONAL DEFICIT, WE MUST REMEMBER THAT IT WAS NOT THE WORKING FAMILIES WHO CAUSED THIS RECORD DEFICIT, BUT THE COMBINATION OF THE IMPRUDENT 1981 TAX CUT AND UNPRECEDENTED MILITARY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPROPRIATIONS WHICH THE PENTAGON ITSELF CANNOT FIGURE HOW TO SPEND. THE FACT IS THAT THE PENTAGON NOW HAS $58 BILLION DOLLARS LEFT OVER FROM PREVIOUS AUTHORIZATIONS BY CONGRESS - A SURPLUS WHICH MAY VIRTUALLY EQUAL THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THAT GRAMM-RUDMAN-HOLLINGS REQUIRES WE CUT BY THIS OCTOBER 1ST.

RUNNING A MAJOR CITY REQUIRES RESOURCEFULNESS AND DEDICATION. IT PRODUCES FISCAL DISCIPLINE AND IT DEMANDS MAKING DIFFICULT AND SOMETIMES UNPOPULAR CHOICES. AS MAYORS, WE DEMAND NO MORE FROM OUR REPRESENTATIVES IN WASHINGTON THAN WE ASK OF OURSELVES, AND WE WILL TOLERATE NO LESS. THE FACT REMAINS THAT THE WORDS HUNGER AND AMERICA SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO EXIST TOGETHER.

# THE GROWTH OF HUNGER, HOMELESSNESS AND POVERTY IN AMERICA'S CITIES IN 1985

*A 25 City Survey*

**January, 1986**

United States
Conference of Mayors

This report was written by Laura DeKoven Waxman and Lilia M. Reyes of the U.S. Conference of Mayors staff. Additional copies are available for $10 each from Elynor Humber, U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1620 Eye Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, (202) 293-7330.

## SUMMARY

To assess the current status of hunger, homelessness and poverty in cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors surveyed the 25 cities whose mayors are members of its Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness. The survey questioned 1) the demand for emergency food assistance and the local response to it; 2) the extent and demographics of the local homeless population and the availability of shelter and other services for homeless people; 3) the persistence of the hunger and homelessness problems and the impact of the economic recovery on them; 4) economic conditions relating to poverty and unemployment; and 5) the outlook for these problems in 1986.

### HUNGER

- In every Task Force city save one the overall demand for emergency food assistance increased during 1985, on average by 28 percent. In all but two cities, or 92 percent of the Task Force cities, the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance increased during 1985, by an average of 30 percent.

- An average of 17 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance currently goes unmet in the responding cities. Emergency food assistance facilities have to turn people away in two out of three of the responding cities.

- Twenty-two of the Task Force cities, or 88 percent of those surveyed, expect the demand for emergency food assistance to increase during 1986; the remainder expect it to remain the same.

- Low benefits in public assistance programs, poverty and employment problems lead the list of reasons for the persistence of hunger. Every city save one reported that the national economic recovery has not eased the local hunger problem.

- Every survey city except one reported that city government funds -- either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants -- are used to support local emergency food assistance efforts. In 71 percent of these cities, locally generated revenues are used for this purpose.

### HOMELESSNESS

- The demand for emergency shelter increased in nearly nine out of 10 of the survey cities during 1985; the average increase was 25 percent. The demand did not decrease in any of the cities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- In 60 percent of the cities, emergency shelters cannot accommodate all of the people seeking assistance. In over half of those cities, shelters must routinely turn away people in need.

- Homelessness is expected to continue to increase in 22 of the cities during 1986. Homelessness is not expected to decrease in any of the survey cities this year.

- Identified most often as reasons for the persistence of homelessness in cities were: the shortage of housing affordable by low income persons, changes in mental health policies combined with a lack of community services for chronically mentally ill individuals, and unemployment problems. In none of the 25 Task Force cities has the national economic recovery lessened the problem of homelessness.

- On average, the composition of the cities' homeless population is 60 percent single men, 28 percent families and 12 percent single women. The number of families with children and the number of single young adults who are homeless have grown significantly in recent years. More persons with chronic mental illness are now found in the homeless population.

- Eighty-eight percent of the responding cities use city government funds -- either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants -- to support shelters and other services for the homeless. Funding sources more frequently used include the Community Services Block Grant, General Revenue Sharing and the federal Emergency Food and Shelter Program.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

- Officials in more than half of the Task Force cities indicated that the number of poor residents increased during 1985. Two cities reported decreases in the number of poor people; seven said the number remained the same.

- All but three of the responding cities indicated that the problems of the "new poor" have continued. Five cities specifically suggest that their numbers have increased.

- The unemployment problem decreased in 46 percent of the responding cities, stayed the same in 29 percent, and increased in one-fourth of them during 1985. City officials expect that in 1986 unemployment will stay the same in 57 percent of the responding cities, increase in 30 percent and decrease in 13 percent.

- All but three of the Task Force cities reported that the "official" unemployment rate does not accurately reflect the actual unemployment problem for their city. The reasons most often cited were the failure to include discouraged workers or the underemployed.

## INTRODUCTION

In October, 1982 the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the U.S. Conference of City Human Services Officials brought the shortage of emergency services -- food, shelter, medical care, income assistance, energy assistance -- to national attention through a 55 city survey. That survey showed that the demand for emergency services had increased in cities across the nation and that on average only 43 percent of that demand was being met.

Since that time the Conference has done numerous reports on hunger, homelessness and poverty in cities. These reports have documented the causes and magnitude of the problems, how cities were responding to them and what national responses were required. They include:

- Hunger in American Cities, June, 1983
- Responses to Urban Hunger, October, 1983
- Status Report: Emergency Food, Shelter, and Energy Programs in 20 Cities, January 1984
- Homelessness in America's Cities: Ten Case Studies, June, 1984
- Housing Needs and Conditions in America's Cities, June, 1984
- The Urban Poor and the Economic Recovery, September, 1984
- The Status of Hunger in Cities, April, 1985

To spearhead the Conference's efforts to respond to the emergency services crisis in cities, Conference President Richard H. Fulton of Nashville, in September 1983, appointed 20 mayors to a Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness, chaired by New Orleans Mayor Ernest N. Morial. When Morial became President of the Conference, he appointed Mayor Raymond L. Flynn of Boston Chairman and expanded the Task Force to 25 mayors. The Task Force has met at least twice each year; many of its members have testified before Congress; and the cities represented on it have provided information to Conference staff on conditions relating to hunger and homelessness for the various reports that have been done.

This report provides information on the current status of hunger, homelessness and the economic conditions which have impacted them in the 25 cities represented on the Task Force. It is made possible by a grant from the American Can Company Foundation. The data were collected from the cities during the month of December, 1985.

# HUNGER

The demand for emergency food assistance increased during 1985 in all but one of the Task Force cities and is expected to continue to increase in all but three during 1986. The numbers of families with children requesting emergency food assistance has grown, as has the number of facilities providing food. In two-thirds of the Task Force cities, some of the people requesting emergency food assistance have had to be turned away. On average, 17 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance goes unmet. At the same time every task Force City save one provides city government funds to emergency food assistance efforts.

## THE DEMAND

In every Task Force city but one, the overall demand for emergency food assistance increased during 1985, on average by 28 percent. In Detroit the demand stayed the same during the year. The overall demand for emergency food assistance did not decrease in any of the Task Force cities during 1985. Boston had the highest rate of increase, 65 percent, followed by Phoenix with 52 percent, Charleston, Hartford, Kansas City and Yonkers with a 50 percent increase and Salt Lake City at 43 percent. Five cities had a rate of increase of ten percent or below: Louisville, New Orleans, New York City, Seattle and Trenton.

In all but two cities, or 92 percent of the Task Force cities, the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance increased during 1985. The average increase in the number of families with children requesting assistance was 30 percent. This ranged from an increase of over 65 percent in Boston, 60 percent in San Juan and 50 percent in Hartford, Kansas City and Yonkers to an increase of nine percent in Trenton and two percent in San Antonio. Detroit and New Orleans officials reported that the number of families with children requesting assistance did not increase during 1985.

## THE CAPACITY

The number of emergency food assistance facilities operating in the Task Force cities varies widely, ranging from one in San Juan, five in Yonkers and six in Nashville to 115 in San Antonio, 135 in Denver, 136 in Boston, 215 in Detroit, 300 in Philadelphia, 357 in New York City and 650 in Chicago. These facilities include soup kitchens, food pantries and shelters which serve meals.

In 11 cities -- Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Hartford, Louisville, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Portland, St. Paul, Trenton and Yonkers -- the number of these facilities increased during 1985. In another ten they stayed the same. Two cities -- San Francisco and Salt Lake City -- indicated that the number of facilities had

decreased. Salt Lake City officials report that one pantry closed due to lack of funding.

THE FUNDING

Every survey city except one reported that city government funds -- either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants -- are used to support local emergency food assistance efforts. While Yonkers used Community Development Block Grant funds in 1985 to support outreach workers for a soup kitchen, it is not able to do so this year. The funds used by the cities come from a variety of sources:

- Seventy-one percent of the cities are using local funds to support emergency food assistance efforts. These include Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City Portland, St. Paul, San Francisco, San Juan, Salt Lake City, Seattle and Washington, D.C.

- State funds are used by 38 percent of the cities, including Detroit, Minneapolis, Nashville, New York City, Philadelphia, St. Paul, San Francisco, Salt Lake City and Seattle.

- Five cities -- Chicago, Louisville, Minneapolis, San Francisco and Seattle -- use General Revenue Sharing funds for this purpose.

- Nine cities -- 38 percent -- use Community Development Block Grant funds. These include Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Louisville, Nashville, San Francisco, San Juan, Salt Lake City and Seattle.

- Eleven cities, or 46 percent, use funds from the Community Services Block Grant. They are Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Minneapolis, Nashville, Phoenix, St. Paul, San Antonio, San Francisco, Salt Lake City and Seattle.

- Seventy-nine percent of the cities use funds provided through the Emergency Food and Shelter Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. These include Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Hartford, Louisville, Minneapolis, New Orleans, New York City, Portland, San Antonio, San Francisco, San Juan, Salt Lake City, Seattle, Trenton and Washington, D.C. Neither Phoenix nor St. Paul are eligible to receive funds under this program.

Among the other sources listed by cities are the U.S. Department of Agriculture's surplus commodities distribution program and private funding. Detroit has a Mayor's Emergency Relief Fund, San Francisco a Mayor's Fund for the Homeless.

## THE UNMET NEED

An average of 17 percent of the demand for emergency food assistance currently goes unmet in the cities which estimated the unmet need. Four cities -- Hartford, Minneapolis, St. Paul and San Antonio -- reported that none of the demand goes unmet. Trenton reported that 25 percent of the demand goes unmet, Washington, D.C. 30 percent, Boston 50 percent and San Francisco 55 percent.

Emergency food assistance facilities have to turn people away in two out of three of the responding cities. These include Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Phoenix, San Juan, Salt Lake City, Seattle, Trenton and Yonkers. In seven cities, facilities do not have to turn people away. Of those cities in which facilities do have to turn people away, in one they must do so infrequently, in nine occasionally, and in six routinely. Those cities in which people are turned away routinely include Boston, Denver, Nashville, New York City, Salt Lake City and Yonkers. Salt Lake City reported that routinely there are staffing problems that do not allow facilities to remain open; occasionally, there is a shortage of food. Phoenix indicated that some people are turned away because they do not meet the program eligibility requirements, not because of a lack of food.

## THE PROBLEM

Low benefits in public assistance programs, poverty, and employment problems lead the list of reasons given by officials in the Task Force cities for the persistence of hunger. Other causes identified include specific problems relating to the administration of and eligibility for the Food Stamp Program, homelessness, particularly among the the chronically mentally ill and substance abusers, the high cost of living, the lack of housing affordable by low income people and structural changes in the economy.

Ten cities -- Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Louisville, Nashville, Portland, Seattle, Trenton and Yonkers -- identified low benefits in public assistance programs as a reason for the persistence of hunger. Yonkers officials stated:

> "Federal and state entitlement guidelines are set unrealistically low and do not afford poor families enough money for both food and rent. Many families fall behind on their rent and become homeless; but most simply go hungry. Eighty-four percent of the people using the Hudson Place Soup Kitchen report missing meals because of lack of money, and they report missing an average of over 29 meals each month."

Seattle officials report that "public assistance and food stamp allotments have not adequately kept up with inflation. Cash assistance grants simply do not meet housing, utility and food expenses." Similarly in Detroit, "food stamp and other public

assistance entitlements have not kept pace with inflation. This prevents those who are receiving assistance from living off their allotment for the entire month. Additionally, only one out of every five unemployed persons is currently receiving unemployment benefits. However, they are not yet 'poor' enough to go on welfare."

Related to low benefits are specific problems with the Food Stamp Program, which were identified by six cities. Cleveland cites "changes in the eligibility criteria for food stamps which discourage use." In Seattle "those who do not have permanent living arrangements do not qualify for food stamps. Thus, many transients have to rely on food banks in order to get food." Detroit officials point out that "current regulations make it difficult for those in need to qualify for assistance and in many cases, since outreach dollars have been cut, some may not even be aware that they are qualified."

Salt Lake City officials stated that "a major reason (for the persistence of hunger problems) is that it takes a period of time to receive food stamps, and they don't take care of the full need." New York City cites inadequate food stamp benefits, San Juan a lack of nutritional assistance.

Poverty was identified as a reason for the persistence of hunger by eight cities: Boston, Denver, Minneapolis, Nashville, Phoenix, St. Paul, San Francisco and Trenton. Trenton has over 93 percent of the County's indigent population, as well as the majority of moderate income families. In Phoenix, "the number of poor people continues to increase." In Nashville, "despite a generally healthy economy and substantial progress and prosperity, about 10 to 12 percent of the population, or about 50,000 people, remain below the poverty level with incomes below minimum subsistence levels." Denver specifically identified the elderly poor as a group who find it hard to meet their food needs.

Six cities -- Chicago, Denver, Hartford, New Orleans, Portland and San Francisco -- identified a variety of employment problems as a reason for the persistence of hunger. Chicago, New Orleans and Portland all reference the high rate of unemployment. "The continued high unemployment rate is the main contributor to the hunger problem in New Orleans," according to officials from that city. In Portland, "unemployment rates have remained high due to slow recovery from economic recession." Denver cites the underemployed, who "are finding it hard to meet food needs, especially as more families move into the city seeking employment."

Related to the unemployment problem are structural changes in the economy, which were cited by both Cleveland and Portland as a cause of the persistence of hunger. Portland officials state: "Structural changes in the economic base of the state away from single resource dependency has resulted in greater demand by the 'new poor' for assistance." In Cleveland, "structural changes in

the economy have resulted in a permanent loss of jobs from the local economy."

Two cities -- Boston and Phoenix -- cite the high cost of housing. Boston officials state: "Residents of our city pay a disproportionate share of their incomes for housing. AFDC allots $128/-month for housing at a time when the average rent is $530/month and housing costs are rising at an annual rate of 37 percent." In Phoenix "there is a lack of available low-cost housing, coupled with high utilities cost. As a result, a greater percentage of income is spent on housing and utilities."

Other causes for the persistence of hunger identified by the cities include:

- homelessness, particularly among the chronically mentally ill and substance abusers, by Hartford, Kansas City, Portland and Seattle;
- the high cost of living, by San Francisco, Seattle, and Washington, D.C.;
- migration to the city, by Hartford; and
- cuts in employment and training programs, by Washington, D.C.

## THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY

Every city save one reported that the national economic recovery has not lessened the local hunger problem. Minneapolis reported that the economic recovery has lessened the hunger problem because the city's unemployment rate is lower now. One city did not respond to the question. City officials suggested a number of reasons why the economic recovery has not lessened hunger:

> Boston: "1. Underemployment -- many people make the minimum wage and are still in poverty; 2. The rapidly rising cost of housing and lodging house and SRO conversions; and 3. Federal taxes on low wage jobs take a large portion from the working poor."
>
> Charleston: "The economic recovery has not materially affected the hungry in Charleston. Few, if any have moved from the ranks of the hungry into the category of self-sufficiency."
>
> Chicago: "There has been no significant shift in the economic status of the poor and near poor."
>
> Denver: "Although the underemployed are listed as part of the state average of employed, their inability to meet nutritional needs has not been addressed. High medical bills,

often caused by poor nutrition, add to their difficulties. In addition, the population group composed of the chronically mentally ill has not really benefitted economically from the national economic recovery."

Detroit: "There has not been a significant enough drop in unemployment and public assistance caseloads to indicate that economic recovery has in fact occurred in the City of Detroit. The variance is less than four percent."

Kansas City: "Economic recovery efforts have not been sufficient to counter the social conditions created by less favorable economic times (insufficient low cost housing, deinstitutionalization of mental health patients, unemployment resulting from technological changes)."

Louisville: "The change from a manufacturing to a non-manufacturing industry results in more families at risk."

Nashville: "Our community had a very healthy economy even during the recession. Our low unemployment rate is lower, but many hungry people are unemployable, e.g. children on AFDC, the aged blind and disabled, etc."

New Orleans: "The New Orleans area continues to experience a high unemployment rate, fluctuating between 10 and 11 percent."

New York City: "The loss of food stamp benefits is unaffected by economic conditions."

Phoenix: "Certain local industries -- copper and mining in particular -- have not benefitted from national recovery."

Philadelphia: "The economic recovery has no affect on low income people and, in fact, is countered time and time again by cutbacks in federal programs."

Portland: "The State of Oregon continues to experience signs of economic hardship in the early 1980's, measured in high rates of unemployment, losses in overall income and dwindling ability to provide services. Economists predict no significant relief until the end of the decade."

Salt Lake City: "To date, the national economic recovery has not alleviated the problems of low-income people in Salt Lake City. In fact, it appears that there are more people in need and they are worse off than previously."

San Antonio: "The number of persons in poverty has increased in San Antonio."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

San Francisco: "I don't believe that it has worked its way down to the poor and the homeless."

Seattle: "The national economic recovery has not lessened the hunger problem in Seattle. Factors influencing this unfortunate circumstance are:

- Washington State has not yet seen the benefits of the national economic recovery. The homeless and hungry are arriving in Seattle from more depressed areas of the state where unemployment is as high as 19 percent. The perception that Seattle is a city where jobs are plentiful is a common one.

- Although unemployment figures are down, there are indications that there are large numbers of people whose benefits have expired or who never qualified for the program in the first place.

- Federal support for programs which traditionally have served the poor has declined dramatically. These include employment training and placement services, cash assistance grants which have not kept up with inflation and decreased numbers of persons who qualify for federal aid due to more stringent eligibility requirements."

Trenton: "This recovery has yet to reach the low-income population and does little for people with multi-disciplinary problems who tend to be nonfunctioning to some degree and congregate in urban areas seeking support services."

Washington, D.C.: "As the nation's capital, we have high migration from other depressed areas with different job market skill requirements."

Yonkers: "The numbers of unemployed among workers with few job skills and the number of people on entitlements have remained almost constant. The very poor have simply remained very poor."

## THE OUTLOOK

Twenty-two of the Task Force cities, 38 percent of those surveyed, expect the demand for emergency food assistance to increase during 1986. In Charleston "it has been increasing constantly with no apparent signs that the problem will diminish; in Yonkers "the demand has risen by 50 to 100 percent each year for the last two years." St. Paul sees as a major reason for the projected increase in demand a recent state law which severely tightens the general assistance eligibility requirements and will cut many people out of the program. Also from St. Paul: "the state and local budget crisis has resulted in cuts in programs." Portland officials cite the federal budget problems: "Due to the impact of decreased federal resources stemming from Gramm-Rudman, there will be increased numbers of people seeking assistance. Estimates place the increase at about 10 percent."

Three cities -- Cleveland, Detroit and Minneapolis -- project that the demand will remain the same as it was in 1985. No cities expect it to decrease.

CITY DATA ON HUNGER

| CITY | PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY FOOD IN 1985 | PERCENTAGE INCREASE IN FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN IN 1985 | NUMBER OF EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE FACILITIES | PERCENTAGE OF UNMET NEED | ARE PEOPLE TURNED AWAY? YES | NO | FREQUENCY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boston | 65 | 65+ | 136 | 50 | x | | routinely |
| Charleston | 50 | 22 | 13 | -- | | x | |
| Chicago | 13 | 29 | 650 | 5 | | x | |
| Cleveland | -- | -- | 65 | high | x | | occasionally |
| Denver | -- | 20 | 135 | -- | x | | routinely |
| Detroit | 0 | 0 | 215 | -- | x | | occasionally |
| Hartford | 50 | 50 | 30 | 0 | | x | |
| Kansas City | 50 | 50 | 165 | 20 | x | | occasionally |
| Louisville | 4 | -- | 41 | -- | x | | occasionally |
| Minneapolis | 20 | 20 | 15 | 0 | | x | |
| Nashville | 11 | 15 | 6 | 12 | x | | routinely |
| New Orleans | 5 | -- | 15 | 15 | x | | occasionally |
| New York City | 10 | 25 | 357 | -- | x | | routinely |
| Philadelphia | 25-35 | 20 | 300 | -- | x | | routinely |
| Phoenix | 52 | 40 | 59 | -- | x | | occasionally |
| Portland | 17 | 18 | 8-10 | minimal | -- | -- | |
| St. Paul | -- | -- | 48 | 0 | | x | |
| San Antonio | 2 | 2 | 115 | 0 | | x | |
| San Francisco | 25-30 | 25-30 | 14 | 55 | | x | |
| San Juan | -- | 60 | 1 | 10 | x | | occasionally |
| Salt Lake City | 48 | 23 | 12 | 20 | x | | routinely |
| Seattle | 10 | -- | 50-80 | -- | x | | infrequently |
| Trenton | 10 | 9 | 15 | 25 | x | | occasionally |
| Washington, D.C. | -- | -- | 15 | 30 | | x | occasionally |
| Yonkers | 50 | 50 | 5 | -- | x | | routinely |



114

## HOMELESSNESS

The demand for emergency shelter increased in nearly nine out of ten of the Task Force cities during 1985 and is expected to continue to increase during 1986. Families with children and younger single adults today comprise a greater percentage of the cities homeless population than in the past. In over half of the cities some of the people in need have to be turned away despite the fact that the overall number of shelters in the cities increased by almost half (48 percent) during 1985.

### THE DEMAND FOR EMERGENCY SHELTER

In 88 percent of the cities the demand for emergency shelter increased during 1985. The average increase was 25 percent. In none of the cities did the demand decrease; three -- Hartford, Minneapolis and San Antonio --reported no change. Yonkers experienced by far the highest rate of increase, 100 percent, followed by Charleston with 47 percent, Seattle with 26 percent, Washington, D.C. and Kansas City with 25 percent, New York City with 24 percent, and Trenton, Denver and Philadelphia at 20 percent. Increases of less than 20 percent were reported by Boston, Salt Lake City, San Juan, and New Orleans.

The estimated number of homeless persons in the Task Force cities varies widely. Approximately 500 persons are reported to be homeless in Charleston and in Minneapolis, 1,100 in Saint Paul, 1,750 in Nashville, 2,000 in San Juan, 3,500 in Louisville, 3,750 in Seattle, 5,000 in San Francisco, 6,000 in Portland. In New York City, 14,612 individuals who are members of families are housed by the City, in addition to thousands of single adults. (Information on the estimated number of homeless people in the Task Force cities is provided in the table on page 19.)

### THE POPULATION

The composition of the Task Force cities' homeless population also varies significantly. On average, however, single men comprise 60 percent of homeless persons in the cities, 27 percent are families with children, and 12 percent are single women.

New Orleans has the largest percentage of single men among its homeless, with 90 percent, followed by Charleston with 85 percent, Minneapolis with 84 percent, San Antonio with 82 percent, Louisville with 80 percent, Denver with 73 percent, and Trenton, Phoenix and Salt Lake City with 70 percent. Other cities where single men account for half or more of the homeless population include San Juan, Kansas City, San Francisco, Seattle and Hartford. Yonkers reported the lowest percentage (13 percent) of single men among its homeless.

Families with children comprise 80 percent of the homeless population in Yonkers. Sixty-six percent of New York City's homeless are families. In both Chicago and Boston, 40 percent of the homeless population are parents and their children. Eleven cities, including Charleston, Denver, Minneapolis, Phoenix, San Antonio and San Francisco, estimate that 20 percent or less of their homeless are families.

An average of 33 percent of the people who are homeless in the responding cities are considered to be chronically mentally ill, ranging from six percent in Yonkers, 20 percent in Portland, 40 percent in Louisville, 50 percent in Kansas City to 60 percent in Denver. Substance abusers comprise an average of 37 percent of the homeless population in the cities. Estimates range from 10 percent in Yonkers to 88 percent in Portland. Cities which reported significant percentages of substance abusers among their homeless population include Minneapolis (50 percent), Charleston, Detroit, San Francisco, and New Orleans (45 percent) and Boston (40 percent). In New York City, 25 percent of the single men and eight percent of the single women housed in the City's shelters are considered to be substance abusers.

An average of 27 percent of the homeless in the cities are transients. Estimates of this group range from one percent in Yonkers, 15 percent in Trenton, 20 percent in Denver, Kansas City and Washington, D.C., 33 percent in Minneapolis and San Francisco, 40 percent in Hartford and Salt Lake City, 47 percent in New Orleans to 92 percent in San Antonio.

## CHANGES IN THE HOMELESS POPULATION

Ninety-one percent of the responding cities indicated that the composition of their homeless population has changed in recent years. The most significant difference has been a growing number of families with children, with 85 percent of the cities indicating an increase among this group. Increases in two-parent families are reported by Denver, Detroit, Louisville and Saint Paul. Denver officials note there are "more two parent families seeking shelter because of being unemployed or underemployed." Officials in Detroit and Kansas City indicate there are more women with young children who are homeless in those cities. In Boston, an average of 15 families become homeless every week. Families constitute the fastest growing group among homeless people in Phoenix. Chicago officials indicate "more families with children -- families breaking down due to unemployment, stress, and abuse-- are requesting shelter from the City". Other cities with increasing numbers of homeless families are Cleveland, Nashville, Salt Lake City, San Juan, Seattle, Trenton and Yonkers. A shift from families with children to single adults, on the other hand, has been the principal change in the composition of Washington, D.C.'s homeless population.

Forty percent of the responding cities indicated that their homeless population includes greater numbers of young single adults. Detroit officials report seeing "increasing numbers of persons in the 18-35 year age group." Officials in Boston describe the city's homeless population as "younger, with an average age of 32 to 34 for adults." Other cities where there are more young persons among the homeless include Boston, Charleston, Nashville, New York City, Salt Lake City and Yonkers.

Greater numbers of persons with chronic mental illness among the homeless are reported by 28 percent of the cities. In New York City, more single men housed in the City's shelters have a history of psychiatric hospitalization than previous shelter populations. Portland officials note there are increasing numbers of homeless mentally ill individuals in the city "due to decreases in benefit programs with which to provide treatment and shelter to them." Nashville's homeless population includes more former patients of state psychiatric institutions.

Officials in four of the cities -- San Antonio, Saint Paul, Salt Lake City and Washington, D.C. -- report the number of homeless single women has increased in recent years. Elderly individuals now account for a greater percentage of the homeless population in Saint Paul and in San Francisco. Boston and New York City indicate greater numbers of homeless substance abusers. In San Francisco, the homeless include more veterans and undocumented immigrants. More individuals recently released form prisons are homeless in Nashville. Increasing numbers of "new poor" individuals who have recently become homeless are also found in Nashville. New York City officials describe the population of single adults housed in the City's shelters as "younger, with a majority Black and Hispanic compared to 1960's when most were over 50 years of age and White". Conversely, Charleston officials indicate that "in the past the predominant homeless person was an older Black male. We are seeing increasing numbers of Whites, especially young White males."

## THE CAPACITY

The number of emergency shelters and shelter beds available in the survey cities varies widely. New York City has the greatest number of facilities: 87, including 23 shelters for single adults, and four shelters, five congregate shelters, and 55 hotel lodgings for families provided by the City alone. Chicago follows with 40 shelters, Washington, D.C. with 35, Seattle with 33, Boston with 23, Kansas City with 21, Philadelphia with 20, Saint Paul with 15, and Cleveland with 11 shelters. Cities in which there are 10 or fewer emergency shelters operating are: Charleston, Detroit, Hartford, Louisville, Minneapolis, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Portland, San Antonio, San Juan, Trenton and Yonkers. In Phoenix, an area adjacent to one of the city's four shelters is being used as an "outdoor shelter" where homeless people who cannot be accommodated elsewhere can stay. The area

has been fenced in and is patrolled by police officers to provide greater security and services located at the nearby shelter, including health care, are offered to persons staying there.

In 12 (48 percent) of the cities -- Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Kansas City, Louisville, Nashville, New York City, San Francisco, Seattle, Trenton, Washington, D.C. and Yonkers -- the number of shelters increased by an average of 12 percent in 1985. The number of shelters operating in the remaining cities stayed the same. In Saint Paul the total number of shelter beds decreased although the number of facilities used as shelters stayed the same.

The number of emergency shelter beds in each of the Task Force cities, as well as the estimated number of people who are homeless in those cities are listed in the table on the next page.

In all but one of the Task Force cities services other than emergency shelter have been established to assist homeless people. Health care, provided in 12 of the cities, was the service most frequently mentioned. Those cities include Charleston, Detroit, Kansas City, Philadelphia, Nashville, San Juan, Saint Paul, Phoenix and New York City. Programs which provide job training or placement to homeless individuals have been established in New York City, Portland, Phoenix, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. mental health services, including case management, sheltered housing, outreach and psychosocial services, have been made available in nine cities. Among them are Philadelphia, Portland, Seattle, St. Paul, and Washington, D.C. Other services identified include:

- o assistance in finding permanent housing in Saint Paul, New York City, and Washington, D.C.
- o day programs in Boston, Seattle and Yonkers;
- o "clean up centers" in Portland and Seattle;
- o a network of "warming centers" used in critical weather periods in Chicago;
- o a rent-abatement program in Trenton to prevent homelessness resulting from evictions;
- o the allocation of HUD Section 8 housing units specifically to homeless individuals in Phoenix;
- o outreach services in Cleveland, New York City, Phoenix and Yonkers;
- o emergency shelters specifically for mentally ill individuals in Boston and Philadelphia;
- o money-management services in San Francisco and Portland;
- o and a "shelter hotline" in Denver.

| CITY | ESTIMATED NUMBER OF HOMELESS PEOPLE | NUMBER OF CITY SHELTER BEDS |
|---|---|---|
| Boston | 5,000 | 1,282 |
| Charleston | 500 | 350 |
| Chicago | 12,000-25,000 | 2,700 |
| Cleveland | 5,000* | 350 |
| Denver | 2,200-2,600 | 1,014 |
| Detroit | 12,000-13,000 | 800 |
| Hartford | - | 150 |
| Kansas City | 10,800 | 600 |
| Louisville | 3,500 | 600 |
| Minneapolis | 500 | 380 |
| Nashville | 1,500-2,000 | 668 |
| New Orleans | 2,000 | 550 |
| New York City | - ** | 22,132*** |
| Philadelphia | 2,500 | 2,500 |
| Phoenix | 4,000 | 374 |
| Portland | 6,000 | 319**** |
| St. Paul | 1,100 | 477 |
| San Antonio | 800 | 838 |
| San Francisco | 4,500-5,500 | 3,321*** |
| San Juan | 2,000 | 1,213 |
| Salt Lake City | 600-800 | 500 |
| Seattle | 3,500-4,000 | 1,500-1,800 |
| Trenton | 2,000-3,000 | 200+ |
| Washington, D.C. | 6,429 | 3,291 |
| Yonkers | 700 | 469 |

* Number of people who are homeless at some time during the year.

** New York City currently provides emergency shelter to 3,960 families, comprised of a total of 14,612 individuals including 9,644 children. In addition, there are 4,960 single homeless adults housed in the City's shelters.

*** Total number of beds in emergency shelters and hotels.

**** Another 310 beds are available as needed.

THE FUNDING

All but three of the Task Force cities indicated that city government funds -- either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants --are used to support local shelters or other services specifically for homeless persons. These funds come from a variety of sources.

- Eighty-two percent of the cities use local funds to support services for the homeless. Among them are Boston, Charleston, Chicago, Detroit, New York City, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle, Salt Lake City, Trenton and San Juan.

- Thirteen cities -- 59 percent -- use state funds. These cities include Chicago, Detroit, Hartford, Nashville, New York City, Portland, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, Trenton and Seattle.

- Six cities -- Chicago, Louisville, Nashville, San Francisco, Seattle and Trenton -- use General Revenue Sharing funds to assist homeless persons. Seattle allocated $500,000 in General Revenue Sharing in 1984, $1.3 million in 1985 and $2.2 million in 1986 for emergency services.

- Community Development Block Grant funds are used by 12, or 55 percent of the cities, including Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia, Portland, St. Paul, San Antonio, San Francisco, San Juan, Seattle, Trenton and Washington, D.C.

- Seventeen cities, or 77 percent, use funds provided through the Emergency Food and Shelter Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The eligibility criteria for the program excludes Phoenix and Saint Paul from receiving any of these funds.

Other sources used by the cities to assist homeless persons include the Community Services Block Grant, Social Services Block Grant, and the Health Care for the Homeless Program sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Pew Memorial Trust and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. San Francisco uses funds from the State's Emergency Shelter Program and the Mayor's Fund for the Homeless; Detroit has a Mayor's Relief Fund. Denver and several other cities provide general assistance to homeless persons. Phoenix uses money made available by the County and other local governments to assist the homeless.

## THE UNMET NEED

In over half the Task Force cities (60 percent) emergency shelters have to turn away people in need. These include Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Kansas City, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, Phoenix, Saint Paul, San Francisco, San Juan, Seattle, and Yonkers. In Saint Paul, shelters for battered spouses are unable to serve many of the women and their children seeking assistance. In Seattle, "shelters were forced to turn away 4,641 homeless people in November, 1985, an increase of 26 percent over the same month in 1984. Of those turned away, 76 percent were women and children or young people." Ten cities, including Charleston, Hartford, Minneapolis, New York City and San Antonio, report they are able to meet the demand for emergency shelter. Officials in Salt Lake City indicate that although shelters do not turn people away "it sometimes takes a person a day or so to get placed in a facility. Disorderly alcoholics are also not allowed in the shelters." Of the cities in which shelters can not meet the demand, in nine (60 percent) people in need are turned away routinely, and in six occasionally.

## THE PROBLEM

Shortage of housing affordable by low income persons, problems relating to chronically mentally ill individuals, and unemployment problems are most frequently mentioned by officials in the Task Force cities as reasons for the persistence of homelessness. Other causes cited include inadequate levels of public assistance programs, the high cost of living, cuts in federal and state assistance programs, the loss of Single Occupancy Rooms hotels and other low income housing, and migration of people from other areas seeking jobs but unable to find them.

Fifteen cities identified lack of housing affordable by low income people as a cause for the persistence of homelessness: Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Detroit, Hartford, Louisville, Nashville, New Orleans, New York City, Phoenix, Saint Paul, San Antonio, Minneapolis and Yonkers. Three of the cities -- Boston, Nashville and New York City -- specifically mentioned problems resulting from the loss or reduction of federal housing assistance programs. Detroit officials indicate that "low cost housing, especially federally subsidized public housing programs, are not meeting the needs of the poor." Officials in San Antonio cite "lack of vacancies in public housing and the high cost of housing in the private sector."

Problems relating to chronically mentally ill homeless individuals, many of whom were released from psychiatric institutions, and the lack of services needed to assist them in the community were identified by almost half (48 percent) of the cities. Among them are Boston, Denver, New York City, Philadelphia, Saint Paul, San Francisco, San Juan, Nashville, Seattle and Yonkers. Officials in Seattle indicate that "the State's mental health system

has forced many chronically mentally ill people into communities where they have a difficult time adjusting to an increasingly competitive job market and to stable living conditions. In addition, the government still has not developed or funded an adequate system of care for this population." In Detroit, cuts in mental health programs have resulted in increasing numbers of homeless people "wandering the streets." Yonkers cites "inflexible mental health programs which do not offer sufficient outreach services" and "a shortage of transitional housing for special populations." In Philadelphia, mentally ill individuals continue to be homeless in part as a result of "stringent interpretations of laws that permit involuntary commitment to psychiatric institutions only under very specific criteria (i.e., danger to self or others)." Officials from that city also add that the public "mental health system has failed to provide the spectrum of services needed by this population."

Eleven cities -- Chicago, Kansas City, New Orleans, New York City, Philadelphia, Phoenix, Portland, Seattle, San Juan, Nashville and San Francisco -- identified problems relating to employment as causes of the continued problem of homelessness. Over half of those cities -- Chicago, New Orleans, New York City, Portland, Seattle and San Juan -- cited high levels of unemployment. According to officials in Portland, the "slow recovery from the recession in Oregon, and high unemployment around the state have resulted in increases in the homeless population in the city." Continued high unemployment among young adults has contributed to homelessness in New York City. The lack of non-technical jobs in San Francisco was identified by officials from that city. Nashville cites the "economic dislocation and maladjustment of poorly educated, unskilled workers in a high-tech society." Officials in Philadelphia, referring to structural changes in the economy, note that "the economic recession of the early 1980's has caused significant loss of jobs which have not been regained."

Six cities -- Detroit, Saint Paul, San Francisco, Boston, Nashville, and Washington, D.C. -- cited cuts in federal and state assistance programs. Two of those cities, Boston and Nashville, specifically mentioned reductions in federal housing assistance. Federal cutbacks of entry level employment and training programs were identified by officials in Washington, D.C. Officials in Detroit and San Francisco cited cuts in programs that provide assistance to substance abusers; reductions in mental health programs were also mentioned by Detroit officials. Related to cuts in public assistance programs, Saint Paul officials noted that changes in these programs, including the tightening of eligibility requirements and the elimination of case management and counseling services previously provided, have contributed to the persistence of homelessness in the city.

Again six cities -- Kansas City, Nashville, New York City, Portland, Salt Lake City and Seattle -- identified the loss of low cost housing, including Single Room Occupancy (SRO) hotels. Officials in Portland report that the closing of four SROs in 1985

alone "has put more pressure on the local shelters due to a decrease in available housing." In Kansas City, "progress in the form of physical development of blighted areas has resulted in the reduction of much of the city's low cost housing stock. This housing is often replaced with commercial facilities or with housing which is not affordable by low income people."

Low levels of public assistance were identified as a reason for the persistence of the homeless problem by five cities: Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Seattle and Yonkers. Officials in Detroit state that "public assistance allocations are inadequate to meet current needs." Yonkers officials describe entitlement levels as "unrealistically low". In Cleveland, general relief payments for single individuals provide about only $120 per month for housing. "Housing in this price range is indeed scarce," officials from that city note.

Denver, Phoenix, San Antonio, Washington, D.C., and Salt Lake City all reported that the problem of homelessness continues in part as a result of people who migrate to their city seeking jobs but are unable to find them. Phoenix officials note that the city's relatively low unemployment rate attracts increasing numbers of transients with low skills who do not qualify for the jobs that are available. Similarly, many of the people who are homeless in Salt Lake City, "the crossroad of the Intermountain West," are migrants from other areas of the country. They also include persons from nearby cities where services for the homeless are not available. Officials from Washington, D.C. indicate that, because it is the nation's capital, the city has a high migration of persons from other depressed areas with different skills than those required by the local job market.

Another five cities -- Nashville, Phoenix, San Antonio, Salt Lake City and Washington, D.C. -- cited the high cost of living as a reason for the continued problem of homelessness. Officials in Nashville, San Antonio and Salt Lake City specifically mentioned the high cost of housing. High utility costs contribute to the problem in Nashville and Phoenix. Other factors identified as reasons for the persistence of homelessness by the Task Force cities include:

- high levels of poverty, by San Juan;
- high incidence of substance abuse, by Seattle and Nashville.
- the breakup of families, by Nashville and Saint Paul;
- lack of resources to address the problem, by Charleston and Phoenix;
- domestic violence, by Kansas City, Nashville and Seattle; and

- the lack of programs to meet the specific needs of homeless persons, by New Orleans.

## THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY

In none of the cities surveyed has the economic recovery lessened the problem of homelessness. Officials in Chicago report that "there has been no significant shift in the economic status of the city's poor and near poor." New York City officials note that "the economic recovery, which has yet to benefit the lower end of the economic scale, has not affected the special needs of the homeless people." In Yonkers, "the elderly, disabled people, mothers with young children who lack job skills and can't afford day care, and unskilled unemployed workers have not benefitted from the rise in employment in service industries." Charleston officials indicate that homeless people have not benefitted from the recovery. The gap between those benefitting and those left out just grows wider."

Two cities -- Boston and Salt Lake City -- report that the economic recovery has worsened the problem. "If anything, the recovery has exacerbated the situation as the increased attractiveness of the city has tightened the housing market," officials in Boston indicate. In Salt Lake City, "the national economic recovery has not alleviated the problems of low-income people. In fact, it appears that there are more people in need and that they are worse off than previously."

Sixteen, or 64 percent, of the cities indicate that the national economic recovery has not addressed factors contributing to the problem of homelessness, such as high employment, lack of low-cost housing, deinstitutionalization and lack of services for the chronically mentally ill, and cuts in federal and state public assistance programs. As a result, the recovery has not lessened the problem, they report. "The 'national economic recovery' has not addressed the causes of homelessness. In fact, the so-called 'recovery' denies the existence of such problems," officials in San Francisco suggest. Minneapolis officials note that the problem of homelessness is related to other factors in addition to employment. Other suggestions offered by the cities as to why the economic recovery has not affected the problem of homelessness include the following:

> Nashville: "The national economic recovery has not lessened homelessness in Nashville because of the persistence of problems relating to chronic mental illness and retardation, alcoholism and drug abuse, reductions in the population of state psychiatric institutions, economic dislocation of workers, family breakdown, cuts in federal aid particularly housing subsidies, demolition of SROs, increasing proportion of elderly on low-fixed incomes, higher rents and utility costs, etc."

Kansas City: "The economic recovery has not affected the number of persons released from mental health facilities, nor has it completely addressed the dislocation of low income persons from areas scheduled for economic development."

Portland: "Oregon is experiencing an extended recession that is complicated by the fact that its economy is currently undergoing a transformation. Both the timber and agriculture industries which have traditionally been the mainstays of the economy are being reshaped, resulting in a reshaping of the workforce for more low paying jobs. Thus, high unemployment and less revenue for the state from income tax which could be used to provide services is resulting in continued increases in homelessness."

Phoenix: "The local economy has not benefitted from the national economic recovery. Local industries, such as copper and mining, continue to be depressed."

New Orleans: "New Orleans continues to suffer from high unemployment."

San Juan: "The unemployment rate in San Juan has risen, from 13.3 percent in 1984 to 15 percent in 1985."

Louisville: "Most of the jobs that are available in the city are in the skilled and technological fields."

San Antonio: "The cost of housing continues to increase. At the same time, low income housing -- public or private -- is not being built in the city."

Philadelphia: "Cutbacks and changes in eligibility requirements of public assistance programs have increased the number of poor people in the city. There is also not sufficient housing affordable by this population. As a result, many of those who are being housed in temporary shelters remain living under those conditions because they are unable to afford to move on to anything else."

Saint Paul: "The economic recovery has come at the expense of welfare programs. As a way of addressing their fiscal crisis, federal and state governments have tightened the eligibility requirements of these programs. As a result, thousands of people have been removed from the rolls and have no place to go. The loss of federal housing assistance programs also continues to affect the problem of homelessness in Saint Paul."

Officials in Cleveland cited inadequate levels of public assistance benefits which can be used for housing. Washington, D.C. mentioned cuts in federal employment and training programs, which have limited the ability of cities to assist person in gaining economic self-sufficiency and the continued migration or persons

unable to find employment to the city. Seattle officials suggested several reasons why the national economic recovery has not lessened the problem of homeless and hungry people. They included continued migration from more depressed areas, large numbers of unemployed people who are not receiving benefits and significant cuts in federal support for programs which have traditionally served the poor.

THE OUTLOOK

Twenty-one, or 84 percent, of the cities expect the demand for emergency shelter to increase in 1986. The demand is not expected to decrease in any of the cities. Detroit, Hartford, Minneapolis and Trenton anticipate that the demand for shelter will stay the same. "Based on increased demand for emergency food and shelter and the documented increase in requests for energy assistance, we can assume that the number of poor and homeless people will increase," officials in Portland indicate.

## CITY DATA ON HOMELESSNESS

| CITY | CHANGE IN DEMAND IN 1985 | PERCENTAGE COMPOSITION OF HOMELESS POPULATION | | | | | | ARE PEOPLE TURNED AWAY? | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | FAMILIES | SINGLE MEN | SINGLE WOMEN | MENTALLY ILL | SUBSTANCE ABUSERS | TRANSIENTS | YES | NO | FREQUENCY |
| Boston | increase | 40 | 40 | 10 | 32 | 48 | 38 | x | | routinely |
| Charleston | increase | 5 | 85 | 10 | 50 | 45 | 35 | | x | |
| Chicago | increase | 40 | 40 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 10 | x | | routinely |
| Cleveland | increase | 25 | -- | -- | 14-20 | -- | 5 | x | | routinely |
| Denver | increase | 13 | 73 | 14 | 60 | 41 | 20 | x | | occasionally |
| Detroit | increase | 20 | 55 | 25 | 30 | 45 | 50 | x | | occasionally |
| Hartford | same | 20 | 60 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 40 | | x | |
| Kansas City | increase | 35 | 50 | 15 | 50 | 38 | 20 | x | | occasionally |
| Louisville | increase | 15 | 80 | 5 | 40 | -- | -- | x | | routinely |
| Minneapolis | same | 15 | 84 | 1 | 40 | 50 | 33 | | x | |
| Nashville | increase | -- | -- | -- | 20 | 30 | 15 | x | | routinely |
| New Orleans | increase | -- | 90 | 10 | 10 | 45 | 47 | x | | occasionally |
| New York City | increase | 66 | 30 | 4 | 22-M* | 25-M* | 82-M* | | x | |
| | | | | | 38-F* | 8-F* | 86-F* | | | |
| Philadelphia | increase | -- | -- | -- | 25 | 15 | -- | | x | |
| Phoenix | increase | 20 | 70 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 5 | x | | routinely |
| Portland | increase | -- | -- | -- | 20 | 88 | 23 | | x | |
| St. Paul | increase | -- | 55 | -- | -- | -- | 2-5 | x | | routinely |
| San Antonio | same | 4 | 82 | 13 | 40 | -- | 92 | | x | |
| San Francisco | increase | 15 | 55 | 20 | 45 | 45 | 33 | x | | occasionally |
| San Juan | increase | 24 | 53 | 3** | -- | -- | -- | x | | occasionally |
| Salt Lake City | increase | 20 | 70 | 10 | 45 | -- | 40 | | x | |
| Seattle | increase | 28 | 62 | 7*** | -- | -- | 27 | x | | routinely |
| Trenton | increase | 20 | 70 | 10 | 25 | 25 | 15 | | x | |
| Washington, D.C. | increase | 25 | 38 | 37 | 55 | 15 | 20 | | x | |
| Yonkers | increase | 80 | 13 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 1 | x | | routinely |

* Percentages given are for homeless single adults only.

** Homeless youth comprise the remaining 20 percent.

*** Youth comprise three percent of the homeless population.



127

## ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Well over one-half of the Task Force cities report that the number of poor people increased during 1985. At the same time the unemployment problem decreased in just under one-half of the cities. In contrast for 1986, 13 percent of the cities expect unemployment to decrease. Nearly one-third of the cities expect unemployment to increase next year; 57 percent expect it to remain the same.

### POVERTY

City officials reported that the number of poor people increased during 1985 in 57 percent of the Task Force cities, including Charleston, Chicago, Cleveland, Denver, Louisville, Phoenix, Portland, San Antonio, San Juan, Salt Lake City, Seattle and Yonkers. Two cities -- Hartford and Trenton -- cited decreases in the number of poor people; seven said the number remained the same.

City officials were asked to describe what has happened to the "new poor" -- individuals and families who were forced to seek emergency assistance and/or human services for the first time in their lives as a result of the national economic downturn a few years ago. Three cities saw some improvement in the situation. Hartford officials said "unemployment is less of a problem than a year ago." Minneapolis described "improved conditions for the newly unemployed and for those resettling from areas outside of the city." Nashville compared itself to another survey city: "There is not as large a group here as in other cities like Detroit, which have experienced massive unemployment. Ironically, General Motors has decided to build a Saturn plan in Spring Hill, about 45 miles from Nashville, with some priority for employment given to those laid off in Detroit, but with many economic advantages for this area."

The remaining cities which responded to the question, however, paint a bleaker picture of the plight of the "new poor." Five cities -- Charleston, Chicago, Kansas City, San Antonio and Seattle -- suggest that not only have their problems continued, but their numbers have increased. Below are some of the comments about the "new poor" made by officials in the survey cities:

> Charleston: "Their problems have continued to increase. An entirely new and growing population of homeless and hungry is strong evidence that the problem continues. There are also more cases of people leaving home for the shelter because they have no heat and cannot afford it. Former homeowners and occupants are being forced into the homeless category."
>
> Kansas City: "This group is in large part responsible for the increase in the number of homeless and hungry people in

the city. The problems of the new poor have not been affected significantly by changing economic conditions thus far."

New York City: "For calendar year 1984, a little over 50 percent of the single adults served at city shelters were first-timers."

Yonkers: "The 'new poor' who are women and children have not benefitted from the growth in employment. The poor made homeless by fire, conversion or eviction due to rising rents, are forced into a nomadic life moving from shelter to motel for an average of six months, and often more than a year before they can find even a substandard and barely affordable room or apartment."

Phoenix: "Their problems continue. Many 'new poor' have had to lose everything to be eligible for public benefits because eligibility requirements are so restrictive. There are growing numbers of 'hidden homeless,' people who are doubling or tripling up with families and relatives, who have not been identified as homeless. The State has no preventive services."

Cleveland: "In many cases their problems have continued. This is reflected by the fact that 10 hunger centers in the suburbs of Cleveland feed 1500 people per month. In many cases, because of structural economic changes, the jobs which employed these individuals have disappeared."

Portland: "The 'new poor,' many of whom have migrated to Portland from rural areas of the state, continue to face hardship due to the slow rate of economic recovery experienced by Oregon in comparison with most other parts of the country. A restructuring of the economy of the state is exacerbating a period of negligible economic growth."

New Orleans: "Due to the weak condition of the local economy, the problem of the 'new poor' continues in New Orleans."

San Antonio: "The problems persist because the number of persons at the poverty level continues to increase in San Antonio. Also, the relatively high cost of basic necessities has placed a financial burden on many families whose income is slightly above the poverty level. Tax policies have not been favorable to low income families."

Salt Lake City: "Many of the new poor are structurally unemployed. Improved economic conditions have primarily helped upper middle class individuals and above while exacerbating the problems of the structurally unemployed."

Denver: "We are still confronted with the 'new poor' each time a coal mine shuts down, a Data Tex lays off 2500 people,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

or a sugar beet plant closes. Many develop other skills and some move to other cities to seek a better life."

Seattle: "All of the problems have become worse and the population most needing employment hasn't benefitted from decreased unemployment figures."

San Juan: "Their problems have continued."

Trenton: "All indications are that conditions are much the same."

Chicago described the conditions faced by the different categories of poor people:

"The number of 'new poor' has shown a slight increase, indicated in part by increases in the number of persons on public aid (approximately one in four). The new poor are not being recalled to their former jobs because their former plants are not being reopened and their temporary layoffs are from dying industries which do not benefit from the 'recovery.' Frequently, only low-paying jobs in the service sector are available.

"The working poor enjoy fewer benefits from government programs (e.g. food stamps and child nutrition) because of tightened eligibility requirements. Changes in public housing regulations make it much less advantageous for the working poor to dwell there.

" The chronic poor face the same problems in good times and bad -- lack of child care, illness, and lack of job skills -- but with fewer and less generous programs than in previous years to help remedy these problems."

## POVERTY CASE STUDIES

Officials in the Task Force cities were asked to provide a brief case study which describes the conditions faced by a family or individual in poverty in their city. The case studies describe the conditions facing two-parent families, single-parent families, individuals, and transients:

### CLEVELAND -- AN AVERAGE FAMILY

"In a recent survey completed by the Hunger Task Force of the Inter-Church Council, the average family using a hunger center was described as:

- earning less than $5600 per year;
- having less than a high school education; and
- having last worked in a service or blue collar position."

KANSAS CITY -- A FAMILY OF NINE

"A family of nine is subsisting on a fixed income of $618 per month. Water service in the home has been off for two months because the family income is inadequate to meet rent, electricity, heating costs and other basic needs. There are four young unemployed adults in his household who cannot find work due to limited skills."

LOUISVILLE -- A FAMILY OF FIVE

"The husband in a family of five is a welder by trade, but has been unemployed for several years. He was most recently laid off from a moving company. AFDC is the family's only income. The family has traded their furniture in lieu of rent and owes the utility company over $500."

TRENTON -- AN EVICTED FAMILY

"A low income family is living in a dwelling that does not provide adequate heat. They use their rent money to pay exceedingly high gas and electric bills because they have used their stove for heat. Consequently, they fall behind in their rent payments and are presented with an eviction notice. With no resources to pursue legal action they do not even appear in court to appeal habitability violations and are found in fault and evicted with no place to live."

SAN JUAN -- A TYPICAL FAMILY IN POVERTY

"Salaries in Puerto Rico are lower than in the mainland. In San Juan there are 74,227 family homes (54.1 percent) with an annual income below $7499. A typical poor family of four lives almost entirely subsidized by government in such areas as housing, food checks (Nutrition Assistance Program), Medicaid, water, electricity, education, etc."

DENVER -- FINDING A HOME AND A MEAL

"The immediate problem facing a family living in Denver is finding a home suitable to its income and family needs. The high rent and medical costs oftentimes prevent a family from providing an adequate nutritional meal."

SAN ANTONIO -- HOUSING PROBLEMS

"A family of five (husband, wife, three children) are unable to pay their rent. The husband is a laborer and the employment is not stable. They are evicted. There are long waiting lists for public housing and Section 8 leased housing."

COPY AVAILABLE

SAN FRANCISCO -- A SINGLE MOTHER

"A single, Black, young female is the head of a household with two children. She has poor parenting skills, poor management skills. There are little or no familial support groups or members. All family members are poorly nourished."

CHICAGO -- A SINGLE MOTHER

"A typical poor family in Chicago is headed by a minority (Black or Hispanic) young adult female with two or three children. She is one of the hard-core unemployed and has not worked in 18 months or more. She has been unemployed because of a lack of skills, illness or a lack of child care. She receives various government benefits but still has an income of less than half of the poverty line. Her needs include emergency food, child care, employment training, health care, housing and energy assistance."

YONKERS -- A VIETNAM VETERAN

"Joe is a Vietnam veteran who is divorced. He receives no VA benefits. He works as an unskilled laborer when he can but the jobs peter out. He often lives on welfare and has less than $5 a day for all his needs after paying his rent. He skips meals nearly every day and eats when he can at a soup kitchen, but late checks and unusual expenses make him continually behind in his rent and once a year or so he becomes homeless."

NEW ORLEANS -- A SINGLE ADULT

"Ms. M.J. was employed as a clerk with the State of Louisiana. She earned approximately $1400 a month. A casualty of state budget cuts, she was laid off. Because Ms. B.J. is not disabled and does not have any children she is ineligible for public assistance. Presently she is enrolled in a job training program and receives a small stipend bi-weekly."

SALT LAKE CITY -- A TRANSIENT FAMILY

"A typical transient family in Salt Lake City comes here in an automobile that breaks down. The family has no money and, therefore, seeks public assistance. In many cases it becomes possible for them to reunite with friends or relatives who can help them; in a few cases they become employed and get back into the main stream. In a lot of cases they become overwhelmed by their problems."

PORTLAND -- A TRANSIENT FAMILY

"A family in a town with a lumber mill which has started laying off employees, prepares for the impending loss of a job by selling off family possessions. When the lay off notice comes a series of moves within the rural town result and then the family

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

moves to the Portland area. Money spent in moving may totally deplete financial resources and require living in an auto. Limited shelter in Portland is available for homeless families, and limited welfare assistance is available for two-parent families."

HARTFORD -- A TRANSIENT FAMILY OF NINE

"A family of nine arrived in the city without housing. They could not be accommodated at one location. The family split up between a shelter and a hotel room; then chose to sleep in the car."

CHARLESTON -- A TYPICAL TRANSIENT FAMILY

"A very common case of a family in need in Charleston begins somewhere remote to our city. Many times we find cases of people who have hit hard times in their hometown, packed up everything they own in their car and headed for the 'gold plated streets' where they have been assured jobs exist.

"They arrive, inevitably having spent every last cent they started out with on their car, which has broken down several times along they way. They have no family, no friends, no place to stay, no school arrangements for the children and no job!

"These people already are poor. The breadwinner is typically either unskilled or skilled in areas where the supply of workers greatly exceeds the demand. They are usually proud and very desirous of keeping the family together, but soon frustrated, their hopes and ambitions stymied. The next you hear of them is at the door of a shelter."

UNEMPLOYMENT

Eighty-eight percent of the survey cities report that the "official" unemployment rate does not reflect the actual unemployment problem in their city. The remaining three cities --Minneapolis, New Orleans and Trenton -- report that it does. Minneapolis officials feel that it is accurate "as far as we know" because there are "not a lot of unemployable people too discouraged to look for work."

The fact that the unemployment rate does not include discouraged workers is cited by 12 cities, 48 percent, as an explanation for the inaccuracy of the "official" unemployment rate. These cities are Boston, Cleveland, Denver, Nashville, New York City, Phoenix, Portland, St. Paul, San Antonio, San Juan, Washington, D.C. and Yonkers. Portland officials report that it is estimated that there is at least one discouraged worker for every applicant for unemployment. Similarly, Washington, D.C. officials suggest "the unemployment rate could be doubled if discouraged workers were counted."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Other factors cited by city officials for the inaccuracy of the "official" unemployment rate include:

- failure to include the underemployed -- by Boston, Cleveland, Nashville and Portland;
- failure to include those who have exhausted their unemployment benefits -- by Hartford, Nashville, Seattle and San Francisco;
- failure to include young people -- by Boston, Phoenix, and Kansas City.

In 1985 the unemployment problem decreased in 46 percent of the survey cities. It stayed the same in 29 percent and increased in 25 percent. Those cities in which the unemployment problem increased are Chicago, Louisville, New Orleans, San Antonio, and San Juan.

In contrast for 1986, three cities -- Chicago, Detroit, and Philadelphia -- project that unemployment will decrease. Chicago, however, cautions: "The decrease is expected to be very small -- less than one percent. Unemployment is still disproportionately high among minorities and youth." Thirty percent of the cities expect the unemployment problem to increase in 1986, 57 percent expect it to stay the same. Louisville cites possible layoffs at a local plant as a reason for the anticipated increase. Charleston officials state: "The rate will probably grow when several large building projects are completed. If the UDAG program is eliminated the development potential for the next few years will be severely restricted."

CITY DATA ON ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

| CITY | POVERTY IN 1985 | OFFICIAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE ACCURATE? YES | NO | UNEMPLOYMENT IN 1985 | UNEMPLOYMENT IN 1986 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boston | same | | x | same | same |
| Charleston | increase | | x | same | increase |
| Chicago | increase | | x | increase | decrease |
| Cleveland | increase | | x | decrease | ------ |
| Denver | increase | | x | decrease | increase |
| Detroit | same | | x | decrease | decrease |
| Hartford | decrease | | x | decrease | same |
| Kansas City | same | | x | same | same |
| Louisville | increase | | x | increase | increase |
| Minneapolis | same | x | | same | same |
| Nashville | same | | x | decrease | same |
| New Orleans | same | x | | increase | same |
| New York City | ----- | | x | decrease | same |
| Philadelphia | ----- | | x | increase | decrease |
| Phoenix | increase | | x | decrease | increase |
| Portland | increase | | x | decrease | same |
| St. Paul | ----- | | x | ----- | ----- |
| San Antonio | increase | | x | increase | increase |
| San Francisco | same | | x | decrease | increase |
| San Juan | increase | | x | increase | increase |
| Salt Lake City | increase | | x | same | same |
| Seattle | increase | | x | decrease | same |
| Trenton | decrease | x | | same | same |
| Washington, D.C. | ----- | | x | decrease | same |
| Yonkers | increase | | x | same | same |



135

## APPENDIX

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SURVEY CITIES

| CITY | POPULATION | 1979 POVERTY RATE | OCTOBER, 1984 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE | OCTOBER, 1985 UNEMPLOYMENT RATE |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Boston | 560,847 | 20.2% | 3.9% | 4.1% |
| Charleston | 69,510 | 21.8 | 4.8 | 5.1 |
| Chicago | 2,997,155 | 20.3 | 10.2 | 9.6 |
| Cleveland | 558,869 | 22.1 | 12.6 | 13.5 |
| Denver | 505,563 | 13.7 | 4.8 | 5.1 |
| Detroit | 1,138,717 | 21.9 | NA | 13.4 |
| Hartford | 136,334 | 25.2 | 6.0 | 5.8 |
| Kansas City | 445,222 | 13.2 | 5.6 | 6.2 |
| Louisville | 293,531 | 19.3 | 6.7 | 7.5 |
| Minneapolis | 369,161 | 13.5 | 4.6 | 4.6 |
| Nashville | 455,252 | 12.6 | 3.6 | 4.4 |
| New Orleans | 564,561 | 26.4 | 10.9 | 9.1 |
| New York City | 7,086,096 | 20.0 | 8.4 | 9.7 |
| Philadelphia | 1,665,382 | 20.6 | 6.3 | 7.3 |
| Phoenix | 824,230 | 11.1 | 5.3 | 3.5 |
| Portland | 367,530 | 13.0 | 7.7 | 8.3 |
| St. Paul | 270,443 | 10.9 | 4.9 | 4.9 |
| San Antonio | 819,021 | 20.9 | 7.0 | 5.0 |
| San Francisco | 691,637 | 13.7 | 6.1 | 5.7 |
| San Juan | 522,700 | 47.4 | 15.3* | 13.7* |
| Salt Lake City | 163,859 | 14.2 | 6.1 | 6.6 |
| Seattle | 490,077 | 11.2 | 6.8 | 7.8 |
| Trenton | 92,124 | 21.2 | 7.8 | 7.5 |
| Washington, D.C. | 633,425 | 18.6 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| Yonkers | 192,342 | 9.8 | 5.3 | 5.7 |

*Unemployment rate is for metropolitan area



136

City_____

TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS
INFORMATION SHEET

HUNGER

1. The Demand
Has the demand for emergency food assistance in your city ___increased, ___decreased or ___stayed the same during 1985? By what percentage? ____%.

Has the number of families with children requesting emergency food assistance in your city increased during the last year? ___Yes ___No. If yes, by what percentage? ____%.

2. The Capacity
How many emergency food assistance facilities (soup kitchens, food pantries, shelters which serve meals) are there in your city?

Did the number of these facilities ___increase, ___decrease or ___stay the same during 1985?

Have any such facilities had to close or reduce their services due to a lack of available resources (funding, food, etc.)? ___Yes ___No
Please explain.

3. The Funding
Is your city using city government funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local emergency food assistance efforts? ___Yes ___No
If yes, please specify:
___Local
___State
___Federal
___General Revenue Sharing
___Community Development Block Grant
___Community Services Block Grant
___Emergency Food and Shelter Program (FEMA)
___Other_____

4. The Unmet Need
Please estimate the percent of the demand for emergency food assistance in your city which goes unmet. ____%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Do emergency food assistance facilities in your city have to turn away people in need? ___Yes ___No. Please explain.

5. The Causes
Why do you think hunger continues to be a problem in your city after nearly two years of economic recovery?

6. The Outlook
Do you expect the demand for emergency food assistance in your city to ___increase, ___decrease or ___stay the same during 1986?

HOMELESSNESS

7. The Demand
Has the demand for emergency shelter in your city ___increased, ___decreased or ___stayed the same during 1985? By what percentage? ___%.

What is the estimated number of homeless people in your city?

What percentage of your homeless population are:
Families with children _____%
Single men ____%
Single women____%
Chronically mentally ill ____%
Substance abusers ____%
Transients ____%

How have the characteristics of the homeless population in your city changed in the last few years?

8. The Capacity
How many emergency shelters are there in your city?

How many shelter beds do they provide?

Did the number of shelters ___increase, ___decrease or ___stay the same during 1985? By what percentage? ___%.

Have any shelters had to close due to the lack of available resources (funding, facilities, etc.)? ___Yes ___No
Please explain

What services other than emergency shelters have been established in your city to assist homeless people?

9. The Funding
Is your city using city government funds (either locally generated revenues or federal or state grants) to support local shelters or other services specifically for homeless people? ___Yes ___No
If yes, please specify:
___Local
___State
___Federal
___General Revenue Sharing
___Community Development Block Grant
___Emergency Food and Shelter Program (FEMA)
___Other_____

10. The Unmet Need
Do emergency shelters in your city have to turn away people in need? ___Yes ___No
Please explain.

11. The Causes
Why do you think homelessness continues to be a problem in your city after nearly two years of economic recovery?

12. The Outlook
Do you expect the demand for emergency shelter in your city to ___increase, ___decrease or ___stay the same during 1986?

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

13. Poverty
Did the number of poor people in your city ___increase, ___decrease or ___stay the same during 1985?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What has happened to the new poor, the near poor, the working poor, the chronic poor or other groups of poor people in your city over the last year?

Describe the conditions faced by a real or hypothetical family or individual in poverty in your city?

14. Employment
Indicate how the employment situation has changed in your city during the last year?

How would you characterize the employment situation in your city for the next year?

15. The Economic Recovery
Has the economic recovery helped your city and low income people within it?

We would like to present individual data for each city in the report to be prepared. Please indicate if any of the information you have provided must be held confidential and not specifically referenced in the report.

PLEASE COMPLETE THIS REFORM AND RETURN IT BY DECEMBER 16, 1985 TO LAURA DEKOVEN WAXMAN, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, 1620 EYE STREET, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006.

Person completing form:
Name_____
Title_____
Agency_____
Address_____
Telephone (____) _____

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS
1620 EYE STREET, NORTHWEST
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
TELEPHONE: (202) 293-7330

## TASK FORCE ON HUNGER AND HOMELESSNESS

Raymond L. Flynn, Boston
Chair

Federico Pena, Denver
Vice Chair

Jerry Abramson, Louisville
Marion S. Barry, Jr., Washington, D.C.
Richard Berkley, Kansas City
Henry Cisneros, San Antonio
J.E. "Bud" Clark, Portland
Baltasar Corrada del Rio, San Juan
Palmer DePaulis, Salt Lake City
Dianne Feinstein, San Francisco
Donald Fraser, Minneapolis
Richard Fulton, Nashville
Terry Goddard, Phoenix
W. Wilson Goode, Philadelphia
Arthur J. Holland, Trenton
Ed Koch, New York City
George Latimer, St. Paul
Angelo Martinelli, Yonkers
Thirman L. Milner, Hartford
Ernest N. Morial, New Orleans
Joseph P. Riley, Charleston
Charles Royer, Seattle
George V. Voinovich, Cleveland
Harold Washington, Chicago
Coleman A. Young, Detroit

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. LEON E. PANETTA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND CHAIRMAN, DOMESTIC TASK FORCE, SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER

Over the past few years, I have shared the challenge of improving our domestic food assistance programs with my colleagues on the Select Committee on Hunger. As Chairman of the Domestic Hunger Task Force of the Select Committee, and as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Nutrition of the House Agriculture Committee, no single endeavor has concerned me more than providing effective food relief to all Americans in need.

Recent startling accounts of homelessness have brought the Select Committee together to search for solutions. While we are aware that the homeless population has increased beyond our greatest fears, we are even more troubled by the numbers of families with children experiencing the hardship of homelessness. We recognize that for unemployed and under-employed parents, life without permanent shelter is desparate and degrading. Their plight is a scar on the face of America; it is a travesty in our land of plenty; a cloud of sorrow from which we must help them escape.

Little attention has been focussed on the hunger and malnutrition confronted by families living temporarily in shelters. Those who will testify today will no doubt tell us that people without a permanent address can and do become people without food. Often unable to overcome the barriers of qualification for supplemental food programs, theirs is a harsh and inhumane struggle for survival. It is a struggle that forces them to walk the streets of America by day searching for employment, for affordable housing, and often for food. By night, for some there is temporary shelter, but little hope.

If our support systems are not strong enough to aid homeless American families, we must admit to a terrible failure. If we are to claim for them a deserved justice, we must find ways to break down the barriers they confront. We must find ways to provide them with the food and stamina to live a better life.

Last month, the U.S. Conference of Mayors released a 25-city survey documenting the growth of hunger, homelessness and poverty in America's cities. This report found that in 22 of 25 cities surveyed in 1985, the demand for emergency shelter has increased an average of 25 percent in one year.

The report reveals that 27 percent of the homeless population in these 25 cities are comprised of families with children. In New York, 66 percent of the homeless are families.

In Boston and Chicago, 40 percent without a permanent place to live are families. The Mayor's report confirms earlier shocking accounts that one-fourth of our nation's children under age six live in poverty and that the demand for emergency food and shelter are increasing, at a critical stage in our Federal policy decisions affecting the poor.

Today, the Select Committee on Hunger will explore the characteristics and conditions of the homeless. We will seek to reverse the trend of hopelessness for families without permanent shelter, without financial security, and without a regular source of nutrition. If there are barriers that limit the accessibility of the homeless to adequate nutrition, we hope to find a reasoned approach to eliminate them.

Last year, Congress began this process by adopting a provision of the Food Security Act to provide food stamps to eligible individuals and households with no fixed address. This change in law was intended to reach out directly to the vulnerable and underserved homeless population. While this is indeed not the sole response to the nutritional needs of the homeless, it is a solid point of departure that recognizes their unique circumstances and will begin to help.

Today, I will be interested to learn from the Department about its plans to implement this provision of the Food Security Act, and to receive recommendations from emergency shelter providers and residents about other practical means for improving the nutritional status of homeless families. I am look forward to working together to establish and carry forward an agenda of hope for homeless Americans.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN W. BODE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today concerning efforts to meet the needs of the hungry among the homeless.

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) administers a variety of food assistance programs targetted primarily to persons with low incomes. These programs include:

- The Food Stamp Program
- The Puerto Rico Nutrition Assistance Grant
- The National School Lunch Program
- The School Breakfast Program
- The Special Milk Program
- The Child Care Food Program
- The Summer Food Service Program for Children
- The Nutrition Education and Training Program
- The Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)
- The Commodity Supplemental Feeding Program (CSFP)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- The Temporary Emergency Food Program
- The Nutrition Program for the Elderly
- The Needy Family Program on Indian Reservations and the Trust Territory
- Commodities for Charitable Institutions

Scope of the Food Program Effort

The magnitude of the Federal food assistance effort is dramatized by the Fiscal Year 1985 record. During that year, about $20 billion in food assistance was provided. Approximately 20 million people a month received food stamps, valued at $10.7 billion. During the course of the year, approximately 35 million persons were served by the Food Stamp Program. Further, as an entitlement program, the Food Stamp Program provides benefits to all eligible applicants. Thus, the Food Stamp Program is responsive to changing economic conditions. The program grew to serve 22.6 million persons in March of 1983, but as the economy improved, participation declined to 19.5 million in November, 1985. The Food Stamp Program is indexed to the cost of food so the real purchasing power of food stamps is maintained over time.

In Fiscal Year 1985 there were over 23 million average daily participants in the National School Lunch Program subsidized at an annual cost of over $3.0 billion. Average daily participation in the School Breakfast Program was 3.4 million. 47.5 percent of these school meals are free and another 6.3 percent are

provided at reduced price. The School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs are entitlement programs that increase in size if need increases. Every child from a household with income below 130 percent of the poverty line in a participating school is eligible to receive a free meal.

Last year, the WIC Program provided monthly benefits to approximately 3 million pregnant and post-partum women, infants, and children up to age 5 determined by a health professional to be at nutritional risk. The cost was $1.5 billion. About one-fourth of all U.S. babies under one year of age receive WIC benefits.

Participation in WIC increased 50 percent from 2.1 million to over 3 million persons per month during the period 1981 to 1985. Federal expenditures for WIC have more than doubled since 1980.

Hunger and the Homeless

The homeless issue is complex. First, it is unclear how many homeless persons there are. Estimates vary widely. In May 1984, the Department of Housing and Urban Development released a systematic national study of the homeless which concludes that nationwide there are probably 250,000 to 350,000 homeless persons.

Second, homeless seem to be a mixed group, composed of various subgroups, including displaced families, the unemployed, the mentally ill, and alcohol and drug abusers.

Third, this population has diverse needs, including housing, counseling, employment, medical care and food. At present, the food needs of the homeless are addressed by numerous local public and private organizations as well as several federal agencies.

Specific FNS Programs Which Address the Food Needs of the Homeless

Food Stamps

Current Food Stamp regulations, in effect since 1978, contain no barriers to participation by homeless persons. Benefits cannot be denied because a household lacks a fixed residence. While residency must be verified, applicants who lack written documentation may be approved on the basis of a collateral contact (someone acceptable to the State agency who knows the applicants' circumstances). Cooking facilities are not required for certification.

Although the program was already serving homeless, Congress included a specific requirement in recent legislation (P.L. 99-198, enacted December 23, 1985) that State agencies provide a

method of certifying and issuing coupons to eligible households that do not reside in permanent dwellings or have fixed addresses.

The Food Stamp Program continues to provide benefits quickly to the most needy. Applicant households with gross incomes of $150 per month or less (as well as destitute migrant or seasonal farmworkers) and not more than $100 in liquid resources are entitled to benefits within five calendar days if otherwise eligible.

Commodities

Through food distribution programs, USDA provides foods to State distributing agencies to help meet many of the nutritional needs of the needy, including the homeless. These programs have improved the nutritional quality of the diets of the many people participating in USDA food programs. Two such food assistance programs which have provided assistance to the needy and homeless are (1) the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) and (2) Food Distribution Program for Charitable Institutions.

Under TEFAP, free surplus commodities are provided to needy persons through public and nonprofit organizations. Eligible organizations include soup kitchens, food banks, and service-type organizations such as Salvation Army and Lions Club. Commodities being made available for distribution by State distributing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

agencies are nonfat dry milk, corn meal, flour, honey, cheese, rice, and butter. Since the program began in 1981, over $3 billion worth of dairy and other surplus commodities have been provided through State and local agencies to large numbers of poor and unemployed people. About 23 million persons annually are participating in the program.

Surplus commodities are distributed by USDA to schools and thousands of charitable institutions providing meals to the needy. Charitable institutions, such as churches operating soup kitchens, orphanages, and homes for the aged, receive a wide variety of surplus commodities to help provide meals to needy persons. In fiscal year 1985, nearly $120 million worth of surplus commodities were given that provided meals for about 1.4 million persons in 8,400 charitable institutions.

Other Agency Involvement

The Federal Task Force on the Homeless, which is chaired by the Department of Health and Human Services, began operation in November 1983. The Task Force, comprised of 15 Federal agencies including USDA, works with States and localities both directly and through regional task forces to inform them about USDA and other Federal resources available to communities in meeting emergency needs. The Task Force, for example, has worked to ensure that communities know that the homeless may be eligible for entitlement programs, such as Food Stamps and SSI, enabling

many individuals to receive support on a continuing basis. It also provides assistance in the development of strategies for the use of Federal resources, such as the Administration on Aging's food program, the Community Development Block Grant, the Social Services Block Grant, the Primary Care and other health block grants, and the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) program.

In addition, a number of interagency agreements have been negotiated to provide support for food and shelter operations:

- The General Services Administration (GSA) donates surplus property, equipment, and clothing to food banks and shelter projects. The property and equipment available include refrigerators, kitchen supplies, furniture, medical supplies, heaters, and similar items. The Department of Defense (DOD) also provides incidental support, such as cots and blankets, to shelters at no cost.

- DOD and the Coast Guard enter into agreements which link food banks with commissaries to obtain surplus food. Currently, 186 such agreements are in place. Donations are currently running at the rate of over two million pounds per year.

- DOD also makes available military warehouse space to food banks for storage of food.

- The National Guard has agreed to make its facilities and manpower services available, within the mission of their training operations, to support food and shelter operations. They transport food, clothing, and other surplus property. They also may provide manpower services and allow the use of armories for storage.

- GSA, DOD, HUD, and the Farmers' Home Administration make facilities and single family homes available for use as shelters.

The Influence of "Studies"

What is particularly disheartening to those of us who are working to improve public feeding efforts is the use of special studies which purport to document dramatic need as evidence that federal efforts are failing but which, upon examination, turn out to be so methodologically unsound that no such conclusions are warranted. We are very concerned that the public may conclude from these reports that food assistance for those in need is not available. This is clearly not the case.

A case in point is the recently released study of 150 "hunger counties". In general, this report presents a misleading picture

of hunger in America and the role of the Food Stamp Program. The findings are not substantiated and the conclusion that the Food Stamp Program provided better coverage in the mid to late seventies than in recent years ignores some basic facts:

- Participation in the Food Stamp Program is significantly higher than in the 1970's. This is particularly true because of the elimination of the purchase requirement which substantially increased access to the program. It brought on more southern, rural participants, and increased rural participation by 42 percent.
- Program access has increased through such efforts as expanded mail issuance of benefits and mail, telephone or home visit application procedures.
- Real average per capita benefits have increased. The program provides higher unit benefits than in the 1970's.
- My earlier testimony details the substantial effort represented by the Food Stamp Program in 1985, which spent $12 billion (including administrative funds) and served 35 million people over the course of the year.
- The assertion that participation rates have fallen in recent years in unfounded. <u>There is no evidence of any shrinkage in program coverage over the last five years. Since 1979, USDA estimates have consistently shown that two-thirds of all eligibles receive benefits.</u> More

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

important, the participation rate among the eligible poverty population is substantially higher than in 1979. Furthermore, data from the Bureau of the Census collected since 1979 also show that the proportion of persons in poverty who receive food stamps has not declined.

- The report claims the hunger problem has shifted to the farm belt, but data in the report itself simply do not support this conclusion. The report cites a 1973 Senate Select Committee study which listed 263 "hunger counties," mostly in the South and Southwest. Applying the 1973 criteria to the current group's data yields a dramatic decline in the number of such counties and shows no shift to the farm belt. The report masks this good news by applying different criteria from those used in 1973.
- The report incorrectly equates poverty-level cash income with hunger, and cash income at 125 percent of poverty with Food Stamp eligibility. Although 35 million had incomes at or below the poverty line in 1983, after adjusting for Food Stamp eligibility criteria such as asset limits, only 25 million were actually Food Stamp eligible.
- The relatively low participation in isolated rural areas comes as no surprise. These are often areas

where traditional values prevail and where individuals may be least likely to seek government assistance.

- The report blames recent food stamp legislative changes for the perceived problems. This unsupported conclusion is directly contradicted by the Urban Institute's independent study of the effects of the 1981 and 1982 legislation. That study concluded that the basic structure of the Food Stamp Program was unchanged. It was the first and only study to look at actual data on participation and costs before and after the changes were put in place. It found that the effects of the changes were far less than indicated in earlier reports. According to the Urban Institute, total savings in 1982 were about $450 million to $650 million, less than half an earlier CBO estimate of $1.5 billion. The Urban Institute found that many of the changes to cost-of-living adjustments were temporary. Maximum benefits in the program have fully caught up to earlier levels.

- Other recent studies indicate improvement in general nutritional status. The latest government survey of American food intakes, conducted in 1985, shows that diet adequacy for the highest risk populations (women and children) has improved over the last decade. Furthermore, women and children across all income

levels were remarkably similar in their nutritional intake and status.

The task force report claims that "hunger was almost ended in the 1970's" and cites approvingly a 1979 report by an earlier version of the same task force. Yet, between 1979 and 1984, the percentage of poverty-level Americans receiving food stamps rose from 43 percent to 62 percent. This imperfect but consistent measure demonstrates that the poor have significantly better access to the food stamp program now than when "hunger was almost ended." Last year, this task force used general economic data to proclaim 20 million Americans hungry. However, they neglected to mention that their methodology would have concluded that about the same number was hungry in 1979 when "hunger was almost ended."

Though the task force report does nothing to identify them, the food stamp program does have problems. We must correct the errors that cause the annual denial of over $250 million in food stamps to needy Americans. The same types of error cause over $900 million a year to be wasted. These problems could be reduced if Congress would act favorably on our proposal to strenthen food stamp program accountability.

The American taxpayers and our children, who will be faced with the consequences of Federal budget deficits, ought to be

proud of our efforts to assist those in need. Clearly, every problem has not been solved. All personal hardship has not been alleviated. However, we have an unprecedented Federal food assistance effort that generally addresses the food assistance needs of low-income Americans. To it is added an impressive level of State and local food assistance from both governmental and charitable sources. With that augmentation, we have in this country an expansive food assistance effort. Though it has been improved in recent years, it certainly is not perfect.

We appreciate the invitation to present testimony today and would appreciate the opportunity to work with the Committee to improve food assistance to those in need.

That concludes my formal remarks, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to respond to the Committee's questions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. HAYES, COUNSEL, NATIONAL COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS

Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert M. Hayes. I am counsel to the National Coalition for the Homeless, a federation of organizations, agencies and individuals from some 40 cities and counties across the United States. Our guiding principles are simple: in a society that calls itself civilized, all persons should have the basic resources needed to survive: decent shelter and adequate food. Hunger and homelessness are linked as two bleak faces of the dire poverty gripping growing numbers of our nation's people.

Today I come before you armed with but a single thought: How to convey to you and your colleagues in our federal government the depths and urgency of the national disaster that is hunger and homelessness in America today.

Mr. Chairman, as you have already seen in various parts of this, the richest nation on earth, children are going hungry. In America today, the elderly choose between paying the rent and buying a meal. In America today, families are being pushed from their homes onto the streets because mothers cannot buy food for supper and pay the landlord. In America today, for the young unemployed, the catch phrase "America is back" is little more than a meaningless, and mendacious jingle.

Words cannot adequately describe the depths of despair afflicting the citizens I see all across this country. As you gather in this hearing room, as witnesses offer testimony before you, as findings are reported, discussed and deliberated, as I --

Mr. Chairman -- drone on, millions of Americans are going without the basic needs for survival. As we speak, ever-increasing numbers of men, women and children lack a decent meal and a bed to sleep in. As we debate, others contend with the bitter laws of survival. Yet these struggles take place not in some jungle, or in some "third world". These struggles are being waged here, today, in the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, you and your colleagues on this committee are undoubtedly familiar with the latest scientific reports on hunger. A Harvard University group -- the Physicians' Task Force on Hunger -- recently called hunger a "national, health epidemic." Mr. Chairman, these are not the words of a radical organization, but they are radical words. And they are a searing indictment of our national government's response to hunger.

In January, the U.S. Conference of Mayors issued a report surveying the growth of hunger and homelessness in 25 American cities. Again the verdict was grim. In the muted, cold blooded language of statistical analysis, the report concluded that the need for emergency food assistance increased significantly in 1985 and that a substantial part of that need goes completely unmet.

Who are the victims of this plight?

-They are a family in Des Moines, Iowa, struggling to survive on an average AFDC grant of $344.00 per month. That

39 per cent of what's needed -- according to the federal government -- to survive.

-They are a family of nine in Kansas City living on $618 per month -- unable to pay for basic needs.

-They are a woman in her late sixties who spends her nights standing in the entryway in New York's Grand Central Station because her social security check doesn't allow the luxury of both a place to stay and food to eat.

-They are school aged children in western New York State eating their evening meals at soup kitchens.

-They are David Bright, and his brother, and his friends -- 10,000 strong -- who were homeless last night in New York City.

The plain fact is that this Administration has repudiated the American tradition of offering a hand to those in need.

Housing assistance has been cut 78% since 1980. If the President's proposed budget goes through, that figure will be over 91% next year. Is it any wonder that the number of homeless men, women and children continues to swell year by year?

The Food Stamp Program has been cut by $6.8 billion since 1982. These cuts pushed one million recipients off the program and reduced benefits for another 20 million. The average benefit is now 49 cents per meal. The President's proposed budget seeks, even further cuts and the wholesale elimination of certain programs. Is it any wonder that even the President's own Task Force on Hunger called hunger -- with the wonderful language of a

bloodless understatement -- "a significant problem throughout our nation"?

But it is not just that the traditional anti-poverty programs are being subjected to massive defunding. Those programs that remain are not being effectively used: about one-third of those eligible for food stamps do not receive them. And those who are completely destitute often receive no benefits at all.

The inevitable result of our new national policies -- must I say our new national ethos --is the hunger and homelessness which pervades our nation. What has the federal response been to the crisis? In the face of the devastation that greets us each time we step onto a city street, each time we turn on the T.V. or open a magazine -- the federal government's response is a single paltry relief program: FEMA.

Having butchered the programs that aid the poor, the federal government seeks to solve the inevitable crisis by providing emergency food and shelter through an agency that traditionally aids victims of natural disasters. $70 million -- bitterly fought for this year and again slated for elimination by the President next year -- that is the sole response to the human disaster of homelessness and hunger; the disaster wrought not by floods or hurricanes but by the knowing policy of an Administration that has abandoned its commitment to care for the needy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

What do we propose? In response to the growing poverty whose most extreme manifestation is homelessness, the National Coaltion for the Homeless -- along with over ten other national groups -- proposes the Homeless Persons' Survival Act of 1986. The Proposed Act is based on the principle that the national crisis of homelessness demands a comprehensive federal response.

Homeless people need shelter. But they also need food. Hungry people need food. They also need housing. Poor families and individuals on the brink of destitution need help to prevent the bitter choice between paying the rent and putting a meal on the table. The Homeless Persons' Survival Act proposes amendments to existing federal anti poverty programs to meet the needs of those who are homeless as well as those living on the margin of destitution. The proposed legislation will recognize the need for shelter and for housing and for education and for other values which Americans once believed were available for all -- not just some -- of the people. The legislation, Mr. Chairman, deals specifically with several areas that this Committee has been addressing. The bill will contain the following key provisions for food programs:

1. Outreach The Food Stamp Act now prohibits federal reimbursement to states for outreach activities. Yet we know that a third of those eligible are not getting benefits -- including many homeless persons. Let's take the program out of

the closet and into the sunshine so children can be fed decently.

2. Permit use of food stamps to buy prepared meals.

Under the Food Stamp Act and regulations, the general rule is that food stamps can be used only to buy food at retail stores -- not for prepared meals. The theory is that the food will be cooked at home. Most likely the drafters of the Act did not foresee the massive displacement of Americans from their homes which now prevents their use of the program. An exception to this rule -- similar to that added by amendment for the elderly -- should be made for the homeless, or other people without the ability to cook meals.

3. Ban permanent address requirements for food stamp benefits. The Food Stamp Act should be amended to make explicit that a person may not be required to provide a permanent address to receive benefits. No one -- even the President's people -- seem to disagree with this. Yet across the country address requirements remain routine.

4. Amend the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP). This program provides funds to distribute surplus commodities to emergency feeding organizations. A sensible enough idea -- yet the funding level of the program is insufficient to distribute the available food. While surplus food remains in costly storage, growing numbers of people across the land suffer from hunger. The program should be amended to be made effective.

5. Make pre-release application procedures available. Currently, there is no mechanism for institutionalized persons to apply for Food Stamp benefits before being released. As a result, after being discharged, those people cannot wait until their applications are processed before receiving benefits. During this process, such persons, often without any resources and in a vulnerable condition, are completely abandoned -- and many go hungry. The Food Stamp Act should be amended to provide for a prerelease application procedure.

Mr. Chairman, these are relatively minor changes, yet they may help alleviate hunger a bit, for millions of men, women and children. Still without a reversal of the massive cutbacks in the federal nutrition programs, no serious battle against hunger can be fought -- much less won.

As you continue to fight the good fight on behalf of the homeless and the hungry, Mr. Chairman, remember the sad faces of the children of hunger you have seen. And then remember that the fight for these children is also a fight for what was once good and decent in this country. Sometime, soon I pray, we will stop turning our backs.

HOMELESS PERSONS' SURVIVAL ACT OF 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

Congressional Declaration of Findings and Purpose (p. 7)

TITLE I -- Emergency Relief to the Homeless

Part A. Emergency Shelter for the Homeless

Sec. 101 Establish a national right to shelter.

Establishes a right to overnight shelter for all homeless persons. State governments would administer the program. Costs of providing shelter would be borne 75% by the federal government and 25% by state and local government. Localities would be encouraged to use private non-profit providers. Enforcement would be by private right of action in state and federal courts, with a provision for attorneys' fees. (p. 10)

Part B. Social Security Assistance to the Homeless

Sec. 102 Outreach to homeless individuals eligible for Social Security benefits.

Mandates Social Security Office outreach efforts to homeless individuals eligible for federal Social Security benefits. (p. 11)

Sec. 103 Extension of SSI eligibility for shelter residents.

Eliminates three month limitation on SSI benefits for residents of public shelters. (p. 12)

Part C. Health and Mental Health Care for the Homeless

Sec. 104 Health Services for the Homeless.

Provides community-based health services for the homeless through project grants to public and private non-profit groups. (p. 13)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sec. 105 Emergency assistance to homeless persons with severe mental illness.

Provides 75% funding from federal government and 25% from state or local governments to establish programs to provide mental health services by trained personnel at emergency shelters and other locations where the homeless mentally ill can be found. (p. 14)

Part D. Emergency Food for the Homeless

Sec. 106 Outreach to Homeless Persons Eligible for Food Stamp Benefits.

Amends the Food Stamp Act to provide federal reimbursement for outreach activities directed to the homeless. (p. 15)

Sec 107 Use of food stamps to obtain prepared meals.

Allows homeless people to use food stamp coupons to purchase meals in public or private non-profit eating establishments. (p. 16)

Sec. 108 Purchase of shelter meals with food stamps.

Expands the Food Stamp Act to permit all residents of shelters for the homeless to purchase shelter meals with food stamps. Provides that shelters may not charge food stamps recipients more than non-recipients. (p. 17)

Sec. 109 Increased appropriations for storage and distribution of surplus commodities.

Increases appropriations for storage and distribution of surplus commodities under the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) from $50 to $100 million. (p. 18)

Part E. Emergency Assistance to Homeless Families and Children

Sec. 110 AFDC Emergency Assistance

Expands emergency assistance to homeless families, including emergency housing, by making it mandatory for all states participating in the AFDC program. (p. 19)

Sec. 111 Education for Homeless Children.

Removes barriers to homeless children exercising their right to a public education. Abolishes the present requirement that children have a fixed address in order to attend public schools. (p. 20)

Sec. 112 Assistance to Runaway and Homeless Youth.

Provides increased funding to services for runaway and homeless youth. Amends the law to provide shelter beyond the present 15-day limit. (p. 22)

Sec. 113 Shelters for Homeless Mothers and Infants.

Authorizes a program of federal grants to establish shelters for mothers and their newborn infants. (p. 23)

Part F. Job Training for the Homeless

Sec. 114 Amend the Job Training and Partnership Act to specifically include homeless persons as a target group eligible for special assistance. (p. 24)

Part G. Entitlements Eligibility for the Homeless

Sec. 115 Residency requirements.

Modifies food stamp, SSI, AFDC, Medicaid and Veterans pension programs to ensure that lack of permanent address cannot disqualify an individual from participation in these programs. (p. 25)

TITLE II -- Prevention of Homelessness

Part A. Prevention of Evictions and Foreclosures

Sec. 201 Prevention of unnecessary evictions from public and subsidized housing.

Prevents unnecessary evictions from public and subsidized housing by requiring that local housing authorities ("LHA") must: (1) in the case of non-payment, ensure that the tenant's rent has been computed accurately, and seek other sources of funds to aid the tenant in paying overdue rent, and (2) in the case of eviction for causes other than non-payment, have the case reviewed by a stipulated public agency and (3) take reasonable steps to secure replacement housing where eviction is necessary and homelessness would otherwise result.

Amends HHS Emergency Assistance Program and FEMA regulations to permit allocation of funds for these purposes. (p. 27)

Sec. 202 Prevention of unnecessary evictions from private rental housing.

Prevents or defers evictions from private rental housing where homelessness would result. Provides temporary rent relief by HHS and local government agencies if applicant is not at fault and is likely to repay. (p. 28)

Sec. 203 Mortgage assignment and payment assistance.

Provides alternatives to foreclosure-eviction actions for owner-occupants eligible by reason of limited income and assets. Eligible owner-occupants would be permitted to assign their mortgages to a government or private non-profit agency and remain in residency indefinitely. The agency continues to make mortgage payments and receives a smaller amount remitted by the occupant. Funds provided by Congress make up the difference. The agency continues ownership after the mortgage is retired. (p. 29)

Part B. Preservation of Low Income Housing

Sec. 204 Preservation of single-room occupancy (SRO) buildings.

Require local governments receiving federal funds to enact controls preserving SROs. (p. 30)

Sec. 205 Continuation and expansion of rural housing programs.

Continues and expands rural housing programs in Farmers Home Administration service areas. Provides funding at the 1980 level, when 154,642 families were assisted. (p. 32)

Part C. Prevention of Homelessness of Disabled and Institutionalized Persons

Sec. 206 Withdrawal and reissuance of Section 504 regulations.

Requires HUD to withdraw regulations under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act restricting access to subsidized

housing for mentally disabled persons and to reissue regulations consistent with that section's antidiscrimination mandate. (p. 34)

Sec. 207 Immediate SSI payments to severely mentally ill persons.

Establishes a category of presumptive disability for seriously and chronically mentally ill persons, in order to assist those who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless to obtain essential income support. (p. 36)

Sec. 208 Continuation of full benefits through third month of institutionalization.

Extends disability for full SSI benefits for institutionalized persons, through the third full consecutive month of stay in a Medicaid facility. (p. 37)

Sec. 209 Pre-release procedures for institutionalized persons.

Improves pre-release procedures for persons in institutions to ensure payment of SSI and food stamp benefits upon discharge. (p. 38)

Sec. 210 Automatic eligibility for food stamps by SSI recipients.

Provides automatic food stamp eligibility for households in which members are all SSI recipients. (p. 39)

Part D. Prevention of Homelessness of Families and Children

Sec. 211 Modify AFDC "deeming" rules for extended family members.

Repeals provisions of AFDC statute to eliminate deeming of stepparent, grandparent, and teenage mothers' income in determining eligibility and grant levels. (p. 40)

Sec. 212 Reinstate AFDC benefits to students aged 18 to 21.

Encourages adolescents to complete at least a high school or vocational program by reinstating the AFDC provision that allows states to provide for students from age 18 to 21. (p. 41)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sec. 213 Foster care maintenance program.

Provides for extension of federal IV-E foster care maintenance program to cover older adolescents up to age 21 who are in school, training programs or supervised independent living arrangements. (p. 42)

TITLE III -- Increased Low Income Housing

Sec. 301 Increased funding for HUD Section 8 programs.

Provides increased funding for the HUD Section 8 existing and moderate rehabilitation programs. (Increases to 130,000 and 50,000 units, respectively.) Requires that HUD sell all units in its inventory with subsidies attached to these units. (p. 44)

Sec. 302 Expansion of newly constructed/substantially rehabilitated public housing units.

Expands the number of newly constructed/substantially rehabilitated public housing units to 50,000 units per year. Provides realistic funding levels for operating subsidies and modernization, enabling public housing authorities to maintain and comprehensively repair existing units. (p. 46)

Sec. 303 Increasing the availability of tax-foreclosed properties to house the homeless.

Provides for suitable tax-foreclosed properties to be conveyed to public and private non-profit agencies which can demonstrate a sound plan for providing housing services to the homeless. Local governments not complying with this provision would be denied certain types of federal aid. (p. 48)

Sec. 304 Residential alternatives for homeless mentally ill persons.

Creates incentives and initiatives to encourage the development of a range of supervised residential alternatives to hospitals for chronically mentally ill adults. (p. 49)

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Congressional Declaration of Findings and Purpose

The Congress finds that --

(1) Not since the Great Depression has homelessness in America reached the epidemic proportions that it now has among major segments of the national population. The number of persons homeless in America today is estimated to range from 350,000 to 3 million, and by all accounts is increasing;

(2) In 1984, the Department of Housing and Urban Development estimated that the annual increase nationwide was averaging 10%; in 1985, a survey by the Emergency Food and Shelter Program of the United Way found an average increase of 16%;

(3) The homeless population includes growing numbers of families, single men and women, children and teenagers;

(4) A significant minority of the homeless population is mentally disabled; such persons require specialized shelters and housing;

(5) Both in numbers and in scope, the dimensions of the homelessness crisis have grown beyond the capacity of state and local governments to handle alone;

(6) Given the range of needs among the homeless population, specialized services should be provided in a coordinated manner;

(7) It is in the national interest to strergthen existing programs and to create new federal, state and local cooperative programs to meet the needs of homeless persons, and to undertake specific measures designed to prevent additional homelessness;

(8) Assistance to the homeless should: (a) be community-based, (b) include emergency shelter and sustenance, (c) provide comprehensive support including, but not limited to, clinical treatment, social support services, help in securing entitlements, and (d) seek to secure enduring solutions to the problem of homelessness in America, including transitional and long-term housing arrangements;

(9) It is the right of every person to be free from discrimination because of transient or homeless status; and

(10) It is the duty of every federal agency and every agency or organization that receives federal financial support to ensure that homeless people are accorded the full protection, opportunities and services guaranteed by law.

Purpose of the Act

The dimensions and character of the problem demonstrate that homelessness can no longer be considered a temporary crisis. Rather, as a Congressional committee concluded after exhaustive factual inquiry across the country, homelessness is a massive epidemic that must now be treated as a national emergency. House Committee on Government Operations, The Federal Response to the Homeless Crisis, Third Report, April 18, 1985, at 12. The current federal response, focused on time-limited, "emergency" relief operations, is dangerously inadequate.

The Homeless Persons' Survival Act of 1986 is a comprehensive effort to alleviate and eradicate the distress of widespread homelessness by providing emergency relief as well as preventive and long-range measures. Title I of the legislative package addresses the immediate circumstances of individuals and families who are currently homeless. It seeks to secure the resources -- shelter, food and support services -- necessary to ensure that no one need go homeless anywhere in this country. Title II takes affirmative, preventive action to stem a number of forces producing homelessness today. Finally, Title III contains long-range programs designed to increase the availability of low-cost housing.

## TITLE I. EMERGENCY RELIEF TO THE HOMELESS

### Introduction to Title I

Emergency relief is urgently needed to address the immediate needs of homeless adults, families and children for basic necessities of life such as shelter and food. According to even the most conservative assessments, there is a dramatic discrepancy between the need for shelter and its availability. See, e.g., HUD Report on the Homeless (May, 1984), at 18, 34. Similarly, across the country, the number of homeless persons who are hungry continues to increase at an alarming rate, far outstripping the ability of voluntary agencies to provide assistance. See, e.g., U.S. Conference of Mayors, Hunger in American Cities. (June, 1983); Cuomo, 1933/1983, Never Again (1983), at 9.

The emergency needs of those who are homeless go beyond shelter and food. Homeless persons urgently need health and mental health services to care for existing problems and those caused or worsened by homelessness. Homeless children need to attend schools to preserve the possibility of personal advancement. Homeless adults need job training to help alleviate the unemployment that is now a significant cause of homelessness. (See, e.g., House Committee on Government Operations, The Federal Response to the Homeless Crisis, Third Report (1985), at 5.) All homeless persons urgently need to receive the public assistance benefits to which they are entitled.

AVAILABLE

Part A. Emergency Shelter For The Homeless

Sec. 101 Establish a national right to shelter

BACKGROUND: An entitlement to adequate emergency shelter currently exists in New York, owing to a series of court rulings. A similar right was enacted in November 1984 by 72% of the voters in Washington, D.C. (The District government, however, overturned the voters' initiative at the trial court level.) Class-action suits filed in Atlantic City, N.J., Charleston, W.Va., Philadelphia, Pa., Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo, Ca., have also resulted in favorable rulings for the homeless poor. Other countries, including the United Kingdom, have established a statutory right to shelter.

While the approach may vary, the notion that society has an obligation to provide emergency shelter that meets minimum standards of decency is no longer foreign to the American legal and political system.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Enact federal legislation, similar to the D.C. initiative, entitling any homeless person to decent overnight shelter. State governments would administer the program, either directly or through delegation to local governments, with 75% of the costs to be borne by the federal government and 25% by state and local governments. Localities would be encouraged to use nonprofit providers. The shelter program would be required under the AFDC portion of the Social Security Act, effectively mandating participation nationwide. Standards and reimbursement schedules would be established by HHS. Enforcement would be guaranteed by private right of action in state and federal courts. Attorneys' fees would be provided.

ESTIMATED COST: Using HUD's conservative measure of the shelter gap in 1983 (some 125,000 beds), and assuming the 10% annual increase in need for shelter (or HUD's own estimate, there is currently a shortfall of 150,000 shelter beds. At $10/night/bed, this program would need $550 million to cover the first year's operating costs.

Part B. Social Security Assistance for Elderly and Disabled Homeless Persons

Sec. 102 Outreach to homeless individuals eligible for Social Security benefits

BACKGROUND: The Social Security Administration has acknowledged that a significant portion of the Nation's homeless population is composed of persons who may be eligible for benefits under Social Security programs. See U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services & Social Security Administration, Social Security Information Items, Nov. 1984, at 1. For example, persons unable to work due to disability or age, as well as retired workers, are entitled to benefits; in addition, the dependents or survivors of such persons may be eligible for benefits. Yet, as the Social Security Administration recognizes, id., eligible homeless persons may be unaware of such programs or unable to complete the application process.

In late 1984, the Social Security Administration attempted to improve access to Social Security programs for the homeless by issuing a series of instructions to its 1,300 field offices. Essentially, the field offices were instructed to update their referral files to include shelters, to coordinate activities with local groups concerned with the homeless, and to heighten their employees' awareness of homelessness. Id.

However, experience with this initiative indicates that it has not been effectively implemented. Instead of reaching out to shelters and other programs, local offices wait for the homeless to come to them. Under these conditions, only the most well-informed among the homeless will be likely to apply. See, e.g., House Committee on Government Operations, The Federal Response to the Homeless Crisis, Third Report (April 1985), at 6.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Direct SSA to require its local offices to schedule regular hours at shelters and local programs that serve the homeless in order to take applications for benefits. Accountability procedures would be designed to evaluate the performance of SSA field offices.

Review SSA procedures to eliminate the bureaucratic barriers commonly experienced by homeless persons when they file claims. Procedures should be established to insure that claims are not dropped merely because an applicant is unable to provide sufficient or correct information.

Sec. 103 Extension of SSI eligibility to shelter residents

BACKGROUND: According to a 1983 change in the Social Security Act, individuals living in public emergency shelters for the homeless for a calendar month may be eligible for up to three months of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits in any 12-month period. This provision was intended to provide individuals living in public shelters with resources to secure permanent living arrangements. In addition, in most states SSI benefits are tied to Medicaid, and the provision may enable residents of public shelters to receive health care benefits as well.

However, benefits limited to three months are insufficient. The average number of days spent in shelters by homeless persons or families over the course of a year totals more than three months; even the report of the Department of Housing and Urban Development -- much-criticized for underestimating the plight of the homeless -- estimates that the figure may be as high as six months (see HUD Report on the Homeless, May, 1984, at 29 n.1). Moreover, residents of private shelters may receive SSI benefits without a time limit, and there is no basis for such differential treatment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Eliminate the current three month limitation on SSI benefits for residents of public shelters and extend eligibility to include residents of halfway houses. This will provide continued assistance (including Medicaid eligibility) to individuals in transitional housing programs. The "shelter allowance" portion of the grant will be paid to the local public agency to help defray lodging costs.

Part C. Health and Mental Health Care for the Homeless

Sec. 104 Health services for the homeless

BACKGROUND: Homeless persons have a critical need for adequate health care. The harsh conditions of life on the streets or in emergency shelters may cause or exacerbate illness, converting treatable conditions into serious, even fatal, disease. The plight of homeless pregnant women, receiving no prenatal care, and the recent deaths of homeless infants, graphically illustrate the problem. See Coalition for the Homeless, A Crying Shame (1985); see also Lander, Health Needs of the Homeless (1983). Despite this obvious need, however, homeless persons have particular difficulty obtaining health care. Lacking financial resources, they are usually also uninsured and "undesirable" in the view of many health care providers.

The most direct way to ensure health care for the homeless is to create community-based services appropriate to this population. Currently implemented on a small scale and temporary basis by grants from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, this method needs federal funding for the scope and stability necessary to effective operation.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Establish a grant program to fund local initiatives offering on-site service. Funds would be granted to public and non-profit organizations that will:

1. Deliver community-based health care on sites such as shelters or appropriate community residences, in cooperation with community health centers and local health departments;

2. Establish teams consisting of physicians, nurses, nurse practitioners and social workers to deliver comprehensive, on-site primary care and appropriate casework to the homeless, with assurance of continuity of that care;

3. Arrange for outside funding (e.g., Hill-Burton, local charity funds) of inpatient hospital care for persons referred by local clinics; and

4. Establish a system of referral to local public health agencies dealing with communicable diseases and other public health matters.

Sec. 105 Emergency assistance to mentally ill homeless persons

BACKGROUND: Persons suffering from severe mental illness are particularly vulnerable to rapid deterioration resulting from the deprivation of basic human needs associated with homelessness. See American Psychiatric Association, The Homeless Mentally Ill: A Task Force Report (1984). Nevertheless, such individuals are often prevented--either by their illness or by program barriers--from obtaining access to badly needed emergency services and benefits. In addition, there is a virtual absence of adequate mental health services for the homeless mentally ill. Emergency shelters generally lack the trained mental health staff necessary to identify serious psychiatric disorders and to initiate effective referrals. Existing community mental health programs cannot provide the labor-intensive and skilled work that effective outreach to the homeless mentally ill requires. See id.; see also HUD Report at 38.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Provide federal financial assistance to address the special needs of severely mentally ill homeless persons through grants to states to fund the following local services:

1. Outreach services on the streets and places where homeless persons suffering from severe mental illness can be found;

2. Mental health screening and emergency services in emergency shelters;

3. Informal drop-in centers, including client-run programs, where mental health services and referrals are provided;

4. Case management and advocacy services to ensure that homeless persons suffering from severe mental illness and in need of other services or benefits are assisted in applying for and obtaining such services or benefits;

5. Training for mental health personnel and volunteers to work on shelter support staff and street outreach teams.

The cost of such local projects would be borne 75% by the federal government and 25% by state and local governments.

Estimated cost: $100 million.

Part D. Emergency Food for the homeless

Sec. 106 Outreach to homeless persons eligible for food stamp benefits

BACKGROUND: The Food Stamp Act prohibits federal reimbursement to states for outreach activities to persons who may be eligible for Food Stamp benefits. Yet eligible homeless persons may not receive food stamp benefits either because they are unaware of the availability of such benefits or are unable to complete the application process. See, e.g., House Committee on Government Operations, The Federal Response to the Homeless Crisis, Third Report (April, 1985), at 22, 28; New York State Committee Against Hunger, The Summer Hunger Crisis (July, 1985), at 42 (number of persons in New York State below poverty line who do not receive food stamps is over 940,000). Outreach activities could be critical in providing necessary food for such persons.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Amend the Food Stamp Act to provide federal reimbursement for outreach activities directed to the homeless.

Sec. 107 Use of food stamps by homeless persons to buy prepared meals

BACKGROUND: The Food Stamp Act generally restricts use of food stamps to purchases from retail food stores and does not provide for the purchase of prepared meals. 7 U.S.C. § 2013(a). However, the Act makes an exception for elderly persons, many of whom lack access to kitchen facilities and are unable to prepare their own meals. The Food Stamp Act allows the elderly to buy prepared meals with food stamp coupons from certified elderly feeding sites (including private restaurants) and from home delivery meal providers. 7 U.S.C. § 2012(g)(4). In 1985, Congressman Addabbo introduced a similar provision for the homeless (H.R. 770).

Homeless persons plainly are in need of food stamps in order to fulfill their basic -- often emergency -- need for food, yet they generally lack access to cooking facilities. Because they are deprived of a basic human requirement -- shelter -- homeless persons are unable to fulfill the equally elementary need for food. This double deprivation is both cruel and illogical.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Amend the Food Stamp Act to allow persons without a fixed address to use food stamp coupons to buy meals in public or private nonprofit establishments and certified feeding sites, including private restaurants.

Sec. 108 Purchase of shelter meals with food stamps

BACKGROUND: Under the Food Stamp Act, residents of "institutions" which provide over 50% of three meals daily are barred from participation in the food stamp program. Homeless persons residing in shelters that provide at least two meals a day are thus unable to receive food stamps.

The Food Stamp Act currently allows five exceptions to the institutional residence restriction. The latest exception, added in 1980, allows residents of shelters for battered women and children to use their food stamps to purchase meals at the shelter. According to the House Report (HR Report 96-788, page 148) on the 1980 legislation, this exception was made to ensure that battered women and children obtain nutritious meals and to reduce the operating costs of shelters.

The 1980 amendment allows the shelter to use food stamps it receives from its residents to purchase food from a wholesaler or a retail food store. However, the shelter cannot redeem the food stamp coupons for cash.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Amend the Food Stamp Act to extend the treatment currently provided to residents of shelters for battered women and children to residents of all emergency shelters. The amendment should also provide that shelters may redeem food stamps only for food and cannot charge food stamp recipients more for meals than non-recipients.

Sec. 109 Increase appropriations for storage and distribution of surplus commodities

BACKGROUND: Under the Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), surplus commodities (e.g., cheese, butter, nonfat dry milk, honey, cornmeal, flour, rice) are distributed to states, which, in turn, distribute them to low-income persons through private nonprofit food banks and public agencies. In 1984 and 1985, $50 million was authorized and appropriated for payment to states to cover storage and distribution costs incurred by emergency feeding organizations. Regulations provide a formula which determines a state's allocation of these funds. In addition, they require states to pass along at least 20% of their apportionment to emergency feeding organizations towards distribution costs.

The act limits the amount for which states can be reimbursed. As a result, in 1985, certain states were unable to continue distribution because their share of federal funds was exhausted and they could not bear the cost of distribution on their own. See, e.g., New York State Committee Against Hunger, The Summer Hunger Crisis (July 1985), at 2, 32. Thus, while commodities were available, they could not be used.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: As part of the renewal of TEFAP, authorize $100 million to states and local emergency feeding organizations for the costs of storing and distributing surplus commodities.

Part E. Emergency Assistance to Homeless Families and Children

Sec. 110 AFDC emergency assistance to homeless families

BACKGROUND: The Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, part of the Social Security Act, provides for federal assistance to families with needy children under the age of 21. 42 U.S.C. § 602, et seq. The program is administered through the states, each of which must specify in a "plan" the types of assistance provided.

State AFDC plans may provide for emergency assistance in the form of money payments as well as emergency services, including emergency shelter. 42 U.S.C. §§ 602, 606. The provision of emergency assistance is now optional; however, if a state plan does include emergency assistance, such assistance must be provided as a matter of federal law. States receive a dollar-for-dollar match from the federal government for funds spent for emergency assistance.

In 1984, 25 states, D.C., Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands participated in the emergency assistance program.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Mandate the emergency assistance program for all states which participate in the AFDC program. In addition, all states should be required to include in their programs aid for families who are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless. This aid must ensure, at a minimum, adequate food and shelter.

ESTIMATED COST: It is estimated that during the first twelve months this program would cost $150 million to operate.

Sec. 111 Education for Homeless Children

BACKGROUND: Children who have lost their homes may also lose their right to attend school through a combination of local rules that operate to deny public school education to children living in shelters or lacking a fixed address. See, e.g., Richards v. Port Chester-Rye Union Free School District, No. 11490 (N.Y. Dep't. of Educ., July 17, 1985). For example:

* Homeless children temporarily living outside their original school district are no longer considered residents of that district and are thus not entitled to continue attending their original school.

* Homeless children living inside a school district without a permanent address are not considered residents of that district and are thus not entitled to attend that district's school.

* Homeless children temporarily placed by their parents with a friend or relative are not considered residents of the school district in which they are actually living. Such children are not entitled to attend the local school unless the parents give up guardianship in favor of the friend or relative.

Long absences from school exacerbate the disruption in a child's life caused by homelessness and impede educational progress. In contrast, continued school attendance affords homeless children both a sense of stability and a means to personal advancement.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Require local and state education agencies, as a condition to receiving federal education aid, to comply with the following mandates:

1. State education agencies must adopt and implement plans to ensure that each homeless child within state borders is provided full educational opportunities. Local education agencies must ensure that school social workers, attendance workers or other qualified personnel interview families and children in shelters or other temporary housing within their district in order to determine the educational needs of homeless children.

2. State or local residency laws may not be applied so as to bar any homeless child from attending school. Parents of each homeless child must be afforded the choice of: (1) continuing the child's education in the district of

origin for the remainder of the school year; or (2) enrolling the child in the school district where the child is actually living. This choice must be available regardless of whether the child is living with the parents or has been temporarily placed elsewhere by the parents.

3. Each child must be provided adequate transportation to the school selected according to the provisions in paragraph 2.

4. Records of each homeless child must be maintained by states so that they are immediately available when a child enters a new district. Procedures must be consistent with privacy safeguards under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

5. The education agency must ensure that each homeless child may participate in all educational programs and services, including special programs for handicapped, disadvantaged, or limited English students; vocational education; gifted and talented programs; and school meals.

Sec. 112 Assistance to runaway and homeless youth

BACKGROUND: The Runaway and Homeless Youth Program provides funds for community programs outside the law enforcement and juvenile justice systems. The program serves the needs of youth under 18 who have run away from home, as well as an increasing number of young people who have no home to which they can return. More than one-third of those served leave home because of physical abuse while 40% have experienced other family problems. Two hundred and sixty-five centers are currently funded under the program. The program's National Runaway Switchboard also provides crisis intervention services to approximately 200,000 runaway and homeless young people and their families.

While the program was reauthorized in 1984 for four years, its funding was decreased. It now is funded at $25.25 million for FY 1985. Moreover, program regulations currently allow grant recipients to provide a child with room and board for a maximum of 15 days. This level of funding and assistance is not sufficient to keep up with the growing numbers and needs of homeless children. See Children's Defense Fund, A Children's Defense Budget: An Analysis of the President's Fiscal Year 1986 Budget and Children (1985) at 193-97.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Increase funding for the Runaway and Homeless Youth program to $50 million for FY 1986. Amend the law to provide assistance until permanent room and board are secured.

Sec. 113 Shelters for homeless mothers and infants

BACKGROUND: Homeless mothers with newborn babies face particular difficulties in securing even emergency shelter; where they exist, public family or maternity shelters may either refuse to accommodate newborns, or else shelter them in conditions dangerous to their health and safety. For example, in New York City family shelters deny admission to infants under two months. Coalition for the Homeless, A Crying Shame: Official Abuse and Neglect of Homeless Infants (Nov. 1985). Homeless mothers able to care for their children but unable to find shelter may be forced by child welfare agencies to give up their babies.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Authorize and fund a program of project grants to private non-profit providers to establish or expand shelters for mothers and their newborn infants.

The start-up costs for a pilot program of this kind would not exceed $50 million for the first year and $100 million for the second year.

Part F. Job Training for the Homeless

Sec. 114 Identify homeless persons as a targeted group in the Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA)

BACKGROUND: The goal of the Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA) is the employment and training of the "economically disadvantaged" as well as those persons "facing serious barriers to employment." While homeless people are generally eligible for job training under this statute, making them a target group would focus attention on their plight. This would also help to ensure that local job training plans take steps to address their particular needs, such as placing job counselors in publicly and privately run shelters.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Amend JTPA specifically to include homeless people within the definition of "economically disadvantaged" in 29 U.S.C. § 1503(8), and add homeless people to the list of those encountering "barriers to employment" in 29 U.S.C. § 1603(a)(2). Require the establishment of job training programs at locations providing services to the homeless, such as shelters and drop-in centers.

Part G. Entitlements eligibility for the homeless

Sec. 115 Residency requirements

BACKGROUND: At state and local levels, persons without a fixed or permanent address may be deemed ineligible for food stamps, SSI, AFDC, Medicaid and veterans' pension programs. See, e.g., House Committee on Government Operations, The Federal Response to the Homeless Crisis, Third Report (April, 1985), at 6. Denial results despite regulations and court decisions upholding the right of persons satisfying other eligibility requirements to obtain services without a permanent address.

Without federal legislative action to establish clear and consistent rules for all such programs, the homeless will continue to experience difficulties in obtaining needed services.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Modify food stamp, SSI, AFDC, Medicaid and veterans' pension programs to explicitly provide that lack of a permanent address cannot disqualify an individual from participation in these programs.

## TITLE II. PREVENTION OF HOMELESSNESS

### Introduction to Title II

For many poor households today, an unexpected crisis or unanticipated need may precipitate a downward cycle leading to homelessness. See, e.g., Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development, Homelessness in America: Hearing (December 15, 1982), at 25, 65, 91; see also Hopper & Hamberg, The Making of America's Homeless (December, 1984), at 39. In such cases, preventive action to avert the crisis may stop the fall into homelessness. Assistance programs to prevent unnecessary evictions from badly-needed housing and to preserve what low-income housing exists may help stem the tide of homelessness. Similarly, assistance to institutionalized persons, to permit them to maintain housing that they do have, and to secure essential resources upon discharge, is urgently needed. Finally, federal action is needed to prevent the dissolution of families desperate to maintain their eligibility for public assistance benefits.

Part A. Prevention of Evictions and Foreclosures.

Sec. 201 Prevention of unnecessary evictions from public and subsidized housing

BACKGROUND: Subsidized housing programs are designed to ensure affordable housing for low-income tenants. However, because many low-income households are forced to spend scarce resources on food and emergencies, they may at times have difficulty paying rent. Available evidence indicates a significant number of evictions of low-income tenants by local public housing authorities (PHAs) and by owners of HUD and FmHA subsidized projects.

Because of the shortage of low-income housing, a displaced household may find it impossible to secure affordable replacement housing. Displaced tenants are then forced either to seek makeshift accommodation or to become homeless. Yet PHAs are now under no obligation to attempt to avoid eviction or to ensure that adequate housing is available before evicting tenants.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Amend the public housing, Section 8, HUD and FmHA statutes to require that: (1) before an eviction action for non-payment may be instituted, the PHA or project owner must ensure that the tenant's rent has been computed accurately, and must seek other sources of funds (e.g., HHS Emergency Assistance Program, FEMA funds, etc.) to pay overdue rent; (2) before an eviction action for any reason may be instituted, the PHA or project owner must have the case reviewed by a stipulated public agency; and (3) the PHA or project owner must take reasonable steps to ensure that where eviction is necessary and homelessness would otherwise result, relocation to some other housing or emergency shelter is arranged.

Amend HHS Emergency Assistance Program and FEMA regulations to permit adequate funds for this purpose.

Sec. 202 Prevention of unnecessary evictions from private rental housing

BACKGROUND: Millions of households annually are evicted from their homes; unable to secure replacement housing they can afford, many of these persons eventually join the ranks of the homeless. See, e.g., Koster v. Perales, 598 F. Supp. 1134 (E.D.N.Y. 1983); U.S. Conference of Mayors, Homelessness in America's Cities (June, 1984), at 6, 44, 56, 63. Yet the inability to pay rent that often precipitates eviction may be temporary. In such cases, emergency rental assistance may avert eviction and the homelessness that may ensue.

Certain rental assistance programs are currently in existence. For example, existing HUD rules provide temporary mortgage payment assistance to owners of HUD-insured housing who are undergoing short-term crises. Eligibility for assistance turns on a determination that inability to pay is temporary, that it is not the mortgagor's fault, and that repayment is likely. The State of New Jersey has enacted legislation affording certain similar relief for tenants in private rental housing. Prevention of Homelessness Act, 52 N.J. Stat. Ann. 270-280 (1984).

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Establish a revolving fund administered by HUD permitting a renter who faces eviction for non-payment of rent to a private landlord to apply to a local agency such as a welfare department or housing authority, for temporary rent relief. Such relief would be furnished so long as the renter's problems are temporary, the renter is not at fault, repayment is likely, and certain overall income and asset limits are met. Repayments would be encouraged to help replenish the local revolving fund.



AVAILABLE

Sec. 203 Mortgage assignment and payment assistance

BACKGROUND: About 6% of all mortgages in the U.S. are delinquent by 30 days or more; in high unemployment states this figure approaches 10%. These are the highest rates reported by the Mortgage Bankers Association since it began keeping records in 1953. The resulting foreclosure actions generate severe social disruption of family and community life, often resulting in homelessness.

Protests against foreclosure actions have been widespread, as have been legislative proposals and actions to provide foreclosure relief. Virtually all such measures apply to homeowners in temporary distress -- those who are in arrears through illness, injury or temporary unemployment. Thus, relief is short-term.

This form of relief is inadequate. Many delinquent mortgagors either are unable to resume regular payments after a short period, or can do so only at the expense of other necessities. More basic relief is required.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Permit an eligible owner-occupant, as an alternative to foreclosure, to assign the mortgage to a local government agency or to an authorized non-profit agency. In exchange for this assignment, the household would continue to reside indefinitely. Instead of mortgage payments, the household would make monthly housing payments according to a schedule, subject to geographic variations, based on income and household size.

The agency to which the mortgage is assigned would continue to make payments toward retiring the mortgage. These payments, using funds appropriated by Congress, would make up the difference between the mortgage payment amount and the amount remitted by the household, an amount which may be periodically adjusted.

When the mortgage is retired, the authorized agency would continue to own the home in perpetuity. However, by paying off the accumulated difference between the mortgage payment amounts and the household payments, the assignor could eventually regain ownership.

Should the original occupant move out, the home would be re-occupied by another eligible household, which would make payments on the same basis.

Part B. Preservation of Low Income Housing

Sec. 204 Preservation of single-room-occupancy (SRO) buildings

BACKGROUND: The diminishing supply of SROs is widely recognized as a significant cause of homelessness. As the least expensive housing available on the private market, SROs are a last resort for many potentially homeless individuals. In New York City, for example, one study found that 50% of homeless women interviewed had been living in SROs before becoming homeless. At the same time, it was determined that New York City had lost 87% of its 110,000 low-rent SRO units between 1970 and 1982. Similar trends are found in cities throughout the country. See, e.g., Salerno, et al., Hardship in the Heartland: Homelessness in Eight U.S. Cities, at 81 (Chicago), 118 (Detroit).

The features that make SRO housing attractive to low-income residents -- proximity to downtown areas, shopping, transportation, and other services -- also leave it vulnerable to conversion to more profitable uses. As downtown areas are revived, often with federal assistance, SRO owners come under increasing pressure to sell or convert their buildings. In order to reap the resulting enormous profits, unscrupulous SRO owners may circumvent local laws protecting elderly residents from eviction by tactics of intimidation and harassment. See, e.g., The Coalition for the Homeless & The Gray Panthers of New York City, Crowded Out: Homelessness and the Elderly Poor in New York City, at 28-31. Once lost, SROs are virtually irreplaceable.

The overwhelming majority of SRO occupants are long-term tenants, often elderly, with mobility rates no higher than apartment building residents. If displaced, these tenants will seek other SRO housing in the same city. But when such housing becomes unavailable, many are forced to join the ranks of the homeless.

Some local governments and community-based nonprofit organizations have taken steps to preserve remaining SROs by enacting zoning, demolition and conversion controls. However, preservation of remaining SROs will be impossible unless such measures are strengthened and uniformly applied, and greater financial resources made available.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Require local governments receiving federal funds under the Urban Development Action Grant and Community Block Development Grant programs of the Housing and Community Development Act to enact controls preserving SRO housing. Provide an additional allocation of Section 8 certificates, tied to these units, similar to the Section 8 Substantial and Moderate Rehabilitation programs.

Sec. 205 Continuation and expansion of rural housing programs

BACKGROUND: Because rural communities generally do not contain public gathering places for the homeless such as parks or shelters, the rural homeless are not as dramatically visible as those in urban areas. Nevertheless, the ranks of the homeless in rural areas are increasing, composed of evictees, farmworkers, households whose homes were destroyed by fires, tornadoes, or other disasters, and those who because of unemployment or lack of affordable housing have doubled up with families and friends or moved into clearly inadequate shelter. As potential and actual occupants of large urban shelters, they are an urban as well as a rural concern.

Since 1965, federally assisted housing programs for low-income families in rural areas have been funded mainly through the rural housing insurance fund, administered by the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA). This fund may be used to insure or guarantee loans for single-family homes, rental and cooperative housing, farm labor housing, rural housing sites, and to make rental assistance payments. Loan programs are limited to rural areas with a significant shortage of mortgage credit for low-income borrowers. Since 1980, these funds have been drastically reduced.

In addition, according to a recent HUD study, 4.5 million non-metropolitan area units are "physically inadequate"; of these, 1.4 million are "severely inadequate." Approximately half the households living in substandard housing have annual incomes of less than $9,000 and must be considered at risk of completely losing what housing they have.

Among the rural poor, some are particularly likely to be without adequate shelter. For example, the most recent study of migrant farmworker housing found that 756,000 additional units were needed to shelter migrants. Native Americans also have high unemployment rates and few housing resources, yet federal Indian housing programs are designed for the elderly and families only.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: 1. Restore funds to the Farmers Home Administration rural housing programs at the 1980 level, when 154,642 families were assisted.

2. Establish a program for the acquisition, rehabilitation and operation of emergency shelters by non-profit providers in rural areas.

3. Establish a rural set-aside of FEMA funds. The Urban Institute in its January 1985 Evaluation of the Emergency Food and Shelter Program recommended that the National Board "examine guidelines for provisions that may constrain service delivery in rural areas, and expand provisions to allow for service structures better fitted to these areas." (page 18 of the Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations).

4. Ensure that any legislation authorizing the recruitment of farm laborers from other counties require that such laborers be adequately housed.

5. Increase funding for farm labor housing loans and grants. (Sections 514 and 516 of the Housing Act of 1949). Through the Section 514 program the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make 1% loans to the owner of any farm, association of farmers, Indian tribe, state or non-profits for the purpose of providing housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor. The Section 516 program provides an additional subsidy in order to make such housing more affordable to the occupants.

6. Amend Section 510 of the Act of 1949 to insure that Farmer Home Administration (FmHA) dispose of properties in its inventory, first to the group for whom those funds were intended, second, for another low income use and third, for use as shelters for the homeless. In recent years, FmHA has been accelerating the rate of foreclosure of its properties and subsequently selling those units to speculators on the private market.

7. Adequately fund the FmHA Section 515 and 521 programs for rental housing. Through the Section 515 program the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make low interest loans to non-profits, consumer cooperatives, and Indian tribes to provide rental housing to elderly or handicapped individuals and families in rural areas. The 521 program provides an additional subsidy to a portion of the tenants in some of these projects so that tenants pay only 30% of their adjusted gross income for rent and utilities.

BEST AVAILABLE

Part C. Prevention of Homelessness of Disabled and Institutionalized Persons

Sec. 206 Eligibility of mentally ill persons for HUD-assisted housing

BACKGROUND: In 1983, HUD proposed regulations implementing Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 701 et seq. Contrary to the antidiscrimination mandate of that section, the proposed HUD rules would restrict access to housing for mentally ill persons. In part because of 1,200 adverse comments, the rules have not yet been published in final form. Nevertheless, they have not been withdrawn.

The most serious problem of the draft rules is the definition of eligibility for HUD-assisted public housing, which requires an individual to be:

> [C]apable of independent living (except to the extent that necessary support services are contemplated to be provided in connection with the program or activity or will otherwise be available to such occupant) and of complying with all obligations of occupancy, including the obligation to conduct himself or herself in a manner which will not disturb his or her neighbors' peaceful enjoyment of their accommodation and will be conducive to maintaining the housing facility in a decent, safe and sanitary condition. For example, a chronically mentally ill person whose condition poses a significant risk of substantial interference with the safety or enjoyment of others or with his own health or safety in the absence of necessary supportive services may be qualified for occupancy in a project where such supportive services are provided, but may not be qualified for a project lacking such services.

(emphasis added) These criteria would enable projects funded by HUD to deny housing to chronically mentally ill persons on the assumption that their behavior will "disturb" the neighbors.

In response to the flood of objections, HUD prepared an alternative draft. Like the original, this still unpublished draft requires handicapped persons to meet special eligibility requirements when applying for housing funded by HUD. Further, it provides that projects supported by HUD may inquire about an applicant with professional staff at

hospitals, institutions and related social service agencies, without regard to privacy or confidentiality concerns.

In addition to contradicting the antidiscrimination requirements of the Rehabilitation Act, by limiting housing opportunities for the chronically mentally ill, both versions of the proposed regulation contribute to homelessness.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Direct HUD to withdraw the proposed Section 504 regulations and issue revised rules consistent with non-discrimination mandate of Section 504. These rules apply the same eligibility criteria, such as ability to pay rent and to maintain the property in reasonable condition, to handicapped persons as to other potential tenants. Where a tenant creates unwarranted disturbances -- whatever the cause -- standards and procedures already in place permit eviction.

Sec. 207 Immediate SSI payments to severely mentally ill persons

BACKGROUND: Under the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program, individuals who manifest serious disabling conditions may receive up to three months of payments prior to a full work-up of their case by the state Disability Determination Service (DDS). Any payment made on the basis of such presumptive disability is not considered an overpayment if the individual is subsequently found not to be disabled. Presumptively disabled persons are also entitled to Medicaid benefits comparable to those of other SSI recipients.

However, Social Security practice does not currently include a category of presumptive disability for individuals suffering from serious or chronic mental illness. While many such persons manifest severe symptoms, they cannot be placed on disability until the state office has prepared a full file, a process which may take months. By the time the application process is completed, the applicant often either cannot be located or requires hospital treatment. For the homeless person with severe mental illness, delay may mean the loss of benefits as well as further personal deterioration.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: Require SSA to extend presumptive disability guidelines to include individuals who are chronically mentally ill. Local SSA District Office personnel would certify presumptive disability for any chronically mentally ill individual (as defined by medical and mental health experts and incorporated into regulations by the Secretary). Certification would be for six months. If at the end of this period the SSA, after making its own eligibility determination, concludes that the individual does not meet SSI standards, no repayment is required. An appeal from any adverse decision may be taken.

Sec. 208 Continuation of full benefits during institutionalization

BACKGROUND: Present law requires reduction of SSI benefits to a $25 monthly "personal needs allowance" (PNA) beginning with the first full month a recipient is in a Medicaid facility. This reduction effectively prevents the recipient from maintaining any previous independent living arrangement and increases the likelihood that the recipient will either remain institutionalized for lack of an alternative residential placement or become homeless upon discharge. Social Security Administration data indicate that approximately 8,000 recipients move into Medicaid facilities each month (100,000 per year). The average length of stay is from 30 to 45 days.

Extending eligibility for benefits to persons for the first three months of institutionalization in a Medicaid facility would enable the recipient to continue rental payments. This would ensure the availability of housing upon discharge.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Provide that any institutionalized individual continue to be eligible for benefits for the first three months if that individual

(a) is chronically mentally ill (as defined by the Secretary in regulations);

(b) is reasonably expected to be institutionalized for three months or less, as certified by a physician; and

(c) has a residence to which he may return upon discharge.

AVAILABLE

Sec. 209 Pre-release procedures for institutionalized persons

BACKGROUND: Established in 1978, the Social Security Administration's pre-release program is designed to ease the transition from the institution to the community and to prevent homelessness. The program permits institutionalized persons to apply for supplemental security income (SSI) benefits prior to release from institutions such as mental hospitals and prisons. If granted, SSI payments for essential support, such as housing, food and clothing, are available upon discharge. Under the program, living arrangements are generally made prior to release.

Unfortunately, the pre-release program is not effectively used, apparently because SSA has not adequately publicized its availability or trained staff in its use. In addition, although they are subject to the same eligibility requirements as SSI benefits, food stamp applications are not taken as part of the pre-release program.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

Direct SSA to improve the pre-release program by:

1. Requiring Social Security district and state Disability Determination Service (DDS) personnel to make regular visits to all state hospitals and other institutions to accept and process disability applications;

2. Developing descriptive materials on the pre-release program for use by local Social Security offices and social service departments in hospitals and other institutions;

3. Providing training for employees in local offices;

4. Prescribing a time frame for state agencies within which SSA applications filed pursuant to the pre-release program will be processed to a decision.

Amend the Food Stamp Act to require the Secretary of USDA and the Secretary of HHS to develop a system by which persons applying for SSI prior to their release from an institution can also apply to participate in the food stamp program by executing a single application at the institution.

Sec. 210 Automatic eligibility for food stamps by SSI recipients

BACKGROUND: All SSI and food stamp recipients must meet strict income and resource eligibility limits. Requiring automatic food stamp eligibility would not only make it easier for SSI recipients to participate in the food stamp program but also reduce paperwork associated with application processing. Since food stamps are awarded according to household, such automatic eligibility would apply only to households in which members are all SSI recipients.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Amend the Food Stamp Act to allow households receiving SSI to be certified for eligibility in the food stamp program solely on the basis of that household participating in the SSI program.

AVAILABLE

Part D. Prevention of homelessness of families and children

Sec. 211 Modify AFDC "deeming" rules for extended family members

BACKGROUND: Because benefit programs have not kept pace with rising expenses, many families receiving benefits under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program can survive only by living with other relatives or welfare recipients. In addition, as they assume the burden of parenthood, teenage mothers may need the support and built-in child care provided by sharing a household with relatives. Such arrangements may enable young mothers to complete high school or acquire the job training necessary to become self-sufficient.

Several AFDC provisions undermine these goals and threaten family unity by penalizing extended families for living together. These include: (1) "deeming" of stepparent income, that is, considering a stepparent's income to be available for use by the AFDC recipient, whether or not it is in fact available and irrespective of the needs and expenses of the stepparent; (2) deeming of a grandparent's income to a grandchild where the grandchild and its minor mother live in the same home as the grandparent; and (3) deeming of income from a minor sibling to other siblings living in the home. Under each of these provisions at least a part of the income of various relatives is counted in determining eligibility and grant levels, whether or not such relatives in fact contribute or realistically can be expected to contribute to the AFDC unit.

Teenage mothers have more to lose than their AFDC grants. Welfare workers report that some must leave home to retain AFDC eligibility so that they can feed themselves and their infants. Others are forced out of their homes when they lose benefits. These young parents may then join the ranks of the homeless. See Children's Defense Fund, A Children's Defense Budget: An Analysis of the President's Fiscal Year 1986 Budget and Children (1985) at 107-09.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: To encourage family stability and discourage young parents from leaving or being thrown out of the family home, repeal the AFDC provision requiring that the income of stepparents, grandparents and minor siblings be counted in determining eligibility and grant levels. Treatment of stepparent income should conform to that of other AFDC members.

Estimated cost: Approximately $190 million.

Sec. 212 Reinstate AFDC benefits to high school and vocational students 18 and over

BACKGROUND: In the past, AFDC assistance was provided to students aged 18 to 21; under an October, 1981 change in the law. AFDC is now available only for students up to age 18 who are reasonably expected to complete high school or vocational school by age 19. While a handful of state general assistance programs provide some cash assistance for students until age 21, most do not. Children denied income support may be forced to drop out of school; in addition, such children may be forced to leave home because family resources are no longer adequate to support them once AFDC payments cease. See, e.g., Children's Defense Fund, A Children's Defense Budget: An Analysis of the President's Fiscal Year 1985 Budget and Children (1984).

For these adolescents the cycle of poverty is reinforced by the failure to complete a minimum level of education. Uneducated and unable to find jobs, they may join the ranks of the homeless.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: To encourage adolescents to complete at least a high school or vocational program, reinstate the AFDC provision allowing states to opt to cover students aged 18 to 21.

ESTIMATED COST: $100 million.

Sec. 213 Foster care maintenance program

BACKGROUND: Many young people are forced to leave programs serving children before they achieve self-sufficiency. A 1981 change in Title IV-E of the Social Security Act provides that a child may continue in the federally funded foster care program only through age 17 (or 18 if the youth is in school and can realistically expect to graduate by age 19). Because many foster-care children are forced to live in several different foster homes and thus must also often change schools, it is not unusual for them to graduate from high school several years behind their peers. By establishing an artificial age limit, the law forces many adolescents to be on their own before they are ready. These adolescents may become homeless. See, e.g., Palmer v. Cuomo, No. 2307/85 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., July 17, 1985); Citizens Committee for Children, et al., Homeless Youth in New York City (1983), at 8.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Amend the Title IV-E foster care maintenance program to include adolescents up to the age of 21 who are still in school or in a training program, as well as adolescents who are in supervised independent living programs.

AVAILABLE

## TITLE III. INCREASED LOW INCOME HOUSING

### Introduction to Title III

It is now virtually indisputable that the lack of affordable housing is a significant cause of homelessness. See, e.g., House Committee on Government Operations, The Federal Response to the Homeless Crisis, Third Report, (April 10, 1985), at 3-9, 22; United States Conference of Mayors, Homelessness in American's Cities (June, 1984), at 20, 56, 63, & passim; Cuomo, 1933/1983, Never Again (1983), at 30. Yet in recent years, federal low-income housing programs have been drastically reduced. See House Committee on Government Operations, supra, at 23.

As the impact of cutbacks in long-term programs unfolds and the stock of affordable housing continues to shrink, the current crisis proportions of homelessness are sure to worsen. Federal action is urgently needed to address this underlying cause of homelessness by increasing the availability of low-cost housing. Absent such immediate action, the national cost in both human suffering and stop-gap emergency services will continue to rise.

Sec. 301 Increased funding for HUD Section 8 existing and moderate rehabilitation programs

BACKGROUND: The availability of low-income housing could be significantly increased by expanding the scope of the HUD Section 8 program. This program offers financial assistance to low-income families who live in rental housing designated as newly built, existing, or moderately or substantially rehabilitated.

HUL Section 8 payments made up the difference between an assessment of 30% of a tenant's income and the fair market rent of the particular unit. Tenants eligible for a Section 8 existing unit are provided with a certificate and then must locate the unit on the private housing market; a tenant eligible for a moderately rehabilitated unit may rent one with a 15-year subsidy attached.

In 1983 Congress repealed the authority for HUD to enter into new contracts for new construction or substantially rehabilitated units. As a result, the availability of low-income housing has decreased dramatically. In granting Section 8 certificates, priority is given to persons living in substandard housing who are either displaced or paying more than 50% of their income for rent. Despite this priority, homeless families may encounter lengthy delays because waiting lists are long and the number of available units is shrinking.

When HUD-insured rental units are foreclosed upon and are returned to HUD, the property disposition statute requires that HUD maintain the housing in decent, safe and sanitary condition and then sell the units with subsidies attached if the units were formerly subsidized or were serving low income families at the time of sale (unless the subsidized housing is no longer needed). In several instances, however, HUD has sold units without subsidies, giving tenants Section 8 certificates instead. While certificates may assist particular families, they do not maintain the supply of federally assisted housing in the community. As a result, this practice may exacerbate the critical housing shortage which is a major cause of homelessness.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

(1) Provide sufficient funds to assist 130,000 households through the Section 8 existing program. This figure represents the level of reservations for the Section 8 New Construction, Substantial Rehabilitation and Existing programs in 1980. Approximate annual cost in 1985 dollars at $5,142 per unit is $668,460,000.

(2) Provide sufficient funds for 50,000 Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation units. While this is twice the number of units reserved in 1980, the program is much less expensive than Section 8 new construction or substantial rehabilitation. Approximate annual cost in 1986 dollars at $5,716 per unit is $285,800,000.

(3) Require HUD to maintain all units in its multi-family inventory in a manner that is consistent with the National Housing Act and ensure that when such units are sold, project based subsidies are attached. Enact Sections 122 and 123 of HR 1 as reported by the House Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs July 26, 1985. Estimated cost of unit sold with subsidy in 1986 dollars is $4,873. The FY 86 annual cost (for 5,000 units) is $24,365,000.

Sec. 302 Expansion of newly constructed/substantially rehabilitated public housing units

BACKGROUND: Since 1937 the public housing program has been the federal government's primary low-income rental assistance program. Under this program HUD pays all debt service expenses for public housing, including development and financing costs, plus a share of the ongoing operating expenses. Public housing is owned by state and local Public Housing Authorities (PHAs) and leased to low-income families and individuals, who pay approximately 30% of their adjusted gross income for rent and utilities. Public housing projects may be newly built, substantially rehabilitated, or previously existing units purchased for use as public housing.

Public housing is made available for families and single individuals who are elderly, handicapped or displaced. HUD may grant waivers to permit 15-30% of the units to be rented to non-elderly single individuals. However, elderly and handicapped persons receive priority. In addition, persons paying more than 50% of their income for rent, living in substandard housing or who are displaced have priority over other prospective tenants. Many PHAs have established an additional priority for persons who are without housing, or homeless. Public housing is a vital resource for households where lack of income is the cause of homelessness.

Recently there has been a drastic decline in funding for public housing. A total of 33,000 such units were funded in 1981 but only 5,000 in 1985. For FY 1986 the President proposed a moratorium on additional public housing units. The full House has appropriated funds for an additional 5,000 public housing units in 1986. The Senate Appropriations Committee has proposed that no units be added in 1986 and the final outcome is uncertain. (It should be noted that this same Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on HUD-Independent Agencies estimated in 1984 that 2.8 million very low-income renters were faced with worst-case housing problems.)

Annual operating subsidies for PHAs are necessary to maintain services, provide minimum operating reserves, and make up the difference between rental income and expenses. The amount of money provided to each authority is based on a Performance Funding System formula, which takes into account size, location, type, a unit's age, and several other factors. In recent years the Department has proposed serious reductions in operating subsidies and has even attempted to recapture some of these vital funds. Without adequate operating subsidies, PHAs will be forced to curtail services to tenants and to postpone routine maintenance. If maintenance

is deferred for several years, there is an extreme likelihood that these units will deteriorate to a point of being uninhabitable, which will reduce the supply of affordable housing.

Similarly, many public housing units are in need of major repairs and upgrading. Other units stand vacant for want of funds with which to repair them. Since 1981, HUD has provided funds for such major repairs and management improvements through the Comprehensive Improvement Assistance Program (CIAP). Congress has recently directed HUD to undertake a major study of the repair needs of PHAs and has proposed to alter the means of financing such improvements. Until the results of the study are in and the new financing systems are in place, all efforts should be made to continue channeling resources to these units in order to maintain the supply of affordable housing.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

(1) Provide sufficient funds to construct or rehabilitate 50,000 additional public housing units per year. While this figure represents an increase over 1985 levels (5,000) it barely makes up for the shortfall in the production of affordable housing in recent years. Estimated annual cost in 1986 dollars using tax-exempt financing ($6,700 per unit) is $335,000,000.

(2) Fund public housing operating subsidies at 100% of the Performance Funding System.

(3) Provide modernization funds to PHAs to undertake major repairs to all units with a preference for vacant, uninhabitable units in order to add to the stock of low-income housing.

Sec. 303 Increased availability of tax-foreclosed property to house the homeless

BACKGROUND: Virtually every locality has a continuous supply of housing that comes under its control or ownership because of property tax delinquency. In general, localities are slow to take title to these properties and to dispose of them, whether by sale to the highest bidder or, occasionally, by demolition. Many of these properties are suitable for shelters and longer-term housing for the homeless.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: As a pre-condition for certain types of federal aid (CDBG or FEMA funds), require local governments to adopt the necessary ordinances and administrative procedures to ensure that tax-delinquent properties are taken through in rem proceedings after 12 months of delinquency. Properties suitable for housing or related services should be conveyed to public and private nonprofit agencies serving the homeless which can demonstrate a sound plan for rehabilitating (if necessary) and operating the buildings. Failure by a private agency to do so or use of the property for another purpose would result in reversion of property to local government for disposal.

Sec. 304 Residential alternatives for homeless mentally ill persons

BACKGROUND: The importance of low-cost housing for chronically mentally ill persons is underscored in the American Psychiatric Association's 1984 report on the homeless mentally ill: "Any attempt to address the problems of the homeless mentally ill must begin with provisions for meeting their basic needs: food, shelter, and clothing." The National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors has also emphasized the need for a range of community living alternatives for this population.

As a number of studies have documented, the mentally ill who live in the community require a broad range of residential services: quarterway houses, halfway houses, group homes, supervised residences, board and care homes, foster/family care arrangements, crisis housing, etc.

Federal initiatives are necessary to stimulate more action by the states in developing appropriate community housing and services for the mentally ill.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Authorize the following initiatives through HUD:

1. Increase by 25% Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) to provide funds to be used for group living arrangements and other community residence programs for mentally ill persons who are homeless. Under Section 104, the CDBG can now be used to help meet "community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community." Some communities already use CDBG funds to provide emergency shelter for the homeless mentally ill. The 25% increase would permit such funds to be used for longer-term solutions to the housing problems of this population.

2. Increase by 25% funds under Section 202 of the Housing Act, giving priority to projects that provide group living arrangements for the mentally ill who are at risk of becoming homeless. Technical assistance would be available to community groups wishing to use Section 202 to expedite development of projects for homeless persons.

BEST AVAILABLE

DAN GLICKMAN, KANSAS
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, JR., WEST VIRGINIA
JERRY HUCKABY, LOUISIANA
TONY COELHO, CALIFORNIA
JAMES R. OLIN, VIRGINIA
THOMAS S. FOLEY, WASHINGTON
E. (KIKA) DE LA GARZA, TEXAS
EX OFFICIO MEMBER

ROBERT J. PERSH
STAFF DIRECTOR

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Agriculture
Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing,
Consumer Relations, and Nutrition
Room 1301, Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

E. THOMAS COLEMAN, MISSOURI
GENE CHAPPIE, CALIFORNIA
TOM LEWIS, FLORIDA
EDWARD R. MADIGAN, ILLINOIS
EX OFFICIO MEMBERS

LYNN F. GALLAGHER
MINORITY CONSULTANT

March 19, 1986

Mr. Robert M. Hayes
National Coalition for the Homeless
105 East 22nd Street
New York, New York 10010

Dear Mr. Hayes:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for testifying before the Select Committee on Hunger and bringing to our attention the problems encountered by families, such as David Bright and his family. As I stated during the hearing I would like to understand how children, such as David, come to be in such situation as you and he described during the March 6 hearing.

If possible, would you provide some background information as to what circumstance brought David and his family to be living at the Martinique Hotel. In addition, what type of financial help is his family receiving and what type of additional help do you believe is needed? If you have some suggestions as to how this assistance might be better administered, I would appreciate your thoughts on this issue. Paying exorbitant fees to live in such a hotel as you described does not seem to me to be even at the minimum, an efficient way to run a program.

Once again I thank you for your testimony and look forward to your response.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

Bill Emerson

Bill Emerson
Ranking Minority Member

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# COALITION FOR THE HOMELESS

105 East 22nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10010
(212) 460-8110

April 1, 1986

Representative William Emerson
U. S. House of Representatives
Committee on Agriculture
Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing,
Consumer Relations, and Nutrition
Room 1301, Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Emerson:

Thank you for your letter of March 19, 1986 inquiring further about the plight of homeless families with children in the United States. I am hopeful you will be moved to take a lead in bringing the federal government to more responsible positions in dealing with what is often called the "shame of the nation".

David Bright and his family became homeless, with tens of thousands of other American families, through a conspiracy of social forces and personal, private catastrophes. Homelessness is best understood as the necessary consequence of a gap between the demand and supply of affordable housing for poor people. That inbalance creates a competition for housing -- a survival resource -- and the losers of the competition tend to be the weakest competitors. Charles Darwin teaches who will win and who will lose these competitions, and the categories of the nation's homeless -- the mentally ill, the uneducated and unemployable, single parent families, the elderly -- are simply uncompetitive. Categories, of course, never tell the whole story. Each homeless person or family has its own tragic tale. Loss of income, death of a spouse, a fire, an eviction, or arbitrary onto-off from a government benefit program are all common antecedents to homelessness. Like most other homeless families, the Brights were evicted from their home and were then unable to find replacement housing which they could afford.

As you probably know from Mayor Edward Koch's persistent and well-publicized attacks on David's testimony, each member of a homeless family receives just under $5.90 per day in benefits (including food stamps) to meet their basic needs. In addition to food -- which must be purchased prepared since cooking is not permitted at these hotels -- this money is used for clothes, transportation, baby diapers, toiletries, school supplies and other necessities such as shoes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The total cost of providing emergency shelter to the Brights and other families is scandolous, both in terms of funds squandered and human lives damaged. Both taxpayers and homeless families have a common interest in moving the family from dependence on emergency shelter into the permanent housing which is the foundation for any family's road to independence. Emergency shelter is necessary but, only as a stop-gap. Humanitarian interests demand moving from shelter to housing quickly; fiscal prudence requires the same.

In sum, I'd urge you to support legislation that would require the Department of Health and Human Services to impose minimal qualitative guidelines on what passes for federally supported shelter for families. Second, I would suggest that you join our efforts in explaining to your colleques the link between the federal government's radical disavowal of low income housing policies and the fate of hundreds of thousands of David Brights who languish -- at great public expense -- in emergency quarters for lack of affordable permanent housing.

I appreciate your concern and look forward to cooperating with you in bringing relief to America's homeless poor.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Hayes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Prepared Testimony of Homeless Children From New York City

### DAVID BRIGHT

Dear Chairman, my name is David Bright. I am ten years old. I am homeless. I am often hungry. Right now I live in the Martinique Hotel. The Martinique is a mad house. The hallways are dangerous. Many things could happen to you while you're in the hallways. Like you could be shot or raped. The roaches and rats are a big problem too. But being raped is worse. There are people who rape little boys in the hallways.

I am often hungry because I don't get enough to eat. Homeless kids are taken to schools far away. When the bus comes late I can't even get breakfast at school. When I arrive the bell rings, then breakfast just stops. I just can't think in school when I'm hungry. My mind just stops thinking and this can't go on forever. That's because I want to learn. I want to get a good education. Learning is fun for me.

There are too many little kids in the hotel who never go to school. There just is not enough room in the schools for them. Just like there's not enough homes for poor children and not enough food.

When I grow up I will be the President of the United States. When I am the President every American will have a home. Every American will have something to eat every day. Everyone in America will have a little money in his pocket. When I am President no ten year old boy like me will have to put his head down on the desk at school because it hurts to be hungry.

### LIBERTY EGGINK

Dear Chairman, my name is Liberty Eggink. I'm eleven years old and live in the Martinique Hotel, one of the many shelters for homeless kids in New York City. I feel, well sort of angry about it. It seems like more and more people are homeless and nobody is being helped. It also is a very sad thing that little babies have to suffer the way they are in these homeless families. There is a baby on the fourth floor that has scabies on her body. The baby is only five months old. I don't think any one is really trying to help. We have no place to cook which is hard on the mothers, trying to cook a decent meal for a family with no kitchen, just a hot plate and washing the dishes in the bathroom. Some people hate doing dishes but I like doing dishes in a proper kitchen. Here there is no place to put clean or dirty dishes.

There is no place for kids to play, so they play in the halls. Sunday is the worst because garbage overflows everywhere!!

I feel scared at night when I hear a little kid scream!! It is too dangerous so, I really hate being homeless. I wish we had a home.

### JEWEL EGGINK

Dear Chairman, I'm Jewel Eggink. I am nine years old and I live in the Martinique Hotel. Being homeless is terrible. You can't relax. You're always hiked up and scared. In a real house everything smells nice. I think that things can be better. I just think things can be better.

### DAVID

Dear Chairman, my name is David. I am eighteen years old. I am homeless. While people sit at home and wonder, over a good dinner, or during the commercial break, what should be done about the plight of the homeless in America, children are dying of malnutrition, hunger and despair.

Homelessness is not G rated material. Little children should not be exposed to it. What kind of future does a child have who knows no other life, outside that of a welfare hotel?

There is no future for a homeless child, only the death of childhood.

## Prepared Statement of Veronica Maz, President, Martha's Table

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting me here today. I appreciate the opportunity to testify on behalf of the homeless before the Select Committee on Hunger.

For the past fifteen years, I have worked directly with the homeless --- founding organizations such as S.O.M.E. (So Others Might Eat) and the House of Ruth in the nation's capitol. At present, I am President of Martha's Table, a non-profit organization incorporated in the District of Columbia which operates a soup kitchen for children, a mobile food service called McKenna's Wagon which distributes food to homeless street people and the National Institute For Neighborhood Self-Help which seeks long term solutions to hunger and homelessness.

What that experience has taught me is that short term responses to the immediate needs of the homeless are not sufficient. We, as a nation, need to develop longer term strategies and make better use of existing resources to solve the problems of the homeless.

### The Problem

That a significant population of homeless individuals and families exists in this country is evident, no matter whose figures one uses. This population includes men, women, and children who are experiencing a variety of problems but the ones they all share are homelessness and hunger.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

To respond to these needs shelters and soup kitchens have sprung up across the count.y. Yet, while shelters and soup kitchens may abound and a resourceful homeless individual can usually find something to eat, most often what a person will find is a meal consisting of starches -- macaroni and cheese, beans, or rice. This is hardly a balanced or nutritional meal. That is what I wish to talk with you about today -- a way in which we can better ensure that the homeless are provided with nutritional meals, using benefits to which they are entitled.

The Food Stamp Program was created to "promote the general welfare and to safeguard the health and well being of the Nation's population by raising the levels of nutrition." The homeless are eligible to receive food stamps. In fact, in 1984, the Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture developed special posters informing the homeless of their eligibility and encouraging them to partake of the program. The posters were distributed nationwide to shelter providers.

Probably, there is no other group in the country in greater need of food stamps than the homeless. But their homelessness often makes it impossible for them to benefit from a program for which they are both eligible and of which they are in need. The food stamp program allows recipients to purchase staples and nonprepared foods. Yet, the homeless lack facilities to cook and store food. Stated simply, food stamps as they can presently be used, are of limited utility to the homeless.

Proposal

Therefore, we would propose an amendment to the Food Stamp Act to allow the homeless to use their food stamps to purchase low cost hot meals prepared by non-profit organizations. In the case of Martha's Table, we have referred to this concept as a "food stamp restaurant." The amendment would thus allow an exception for the homeless to the general policy of food stamp use only for non-prepared meals.

"Food Stamp Restaurant" Concept

The food stamp restaurant concept, which is proposed, would be limited to non-profit organizations providing hot meals only to the homeless. The homeless participants would be identified by their Food Stamp I.D. cards. These I.D. cards have the shelter address where individuals receive their cards since they have no permanent address. In this way, only the homeless will be served.

It cannot be overemphasized that the food stamp program was not designed as a profit making venture. The food stamp restaurant concept would be developed in a manner consistent with the non-profit philosophy of the overall progam. This would be ensured by incorporating certain restrictions as to who may

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

qualify as a food stamp restaurant and the practices of those restaurants. First, only non-profit organizations could apply to participate as a food stamp restaurant; this would exclude all commercial restaurants. Second, the food stamps used by the homeless to purchase a hot and nutritious meal could only be redeemed by the program operator for food products through food wholesalers or at a supermarket. No cash transactions would be made. The stamps would be used to purchase vegetables, fruits, meats, and fish. Other commodities would be donated by the community. Third, the cost of a meal would be nominal, approximately $1.00 in food stamps. Fourth, no USDA food would be used or sold. All costs of preparation, program administration and other services would be absorbed by the non-profit contractor through contributions and volunteer assistance. In keeping with the policy of the Food Stamp Act, food stamps would be used only for the purpose of bulk foods.

Great interest in this proposed use of the food stamp program exists throughout the nation. At a conference held on October 3, 4, 1985 in the Dirksen Building, by the National Institute For Neighborhood Self-Help, representatives from 17 states expressed an interest in this approach. Since then, interest has grown. Letters of inquiry about the status of the food stamp restaurant concept are received continuously at Martha's Table. Clearly the interest in this concept extends across the nation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Precedent

According to 7 U.S.C. Sec. 2012, food stamps are issued to "eligible households" to purchase food for "home consumption" from "retail food stores" and may not be used to purchase "hot foods or hot food products ready for immediate consumption (7 U.S.C. Section 2012 (g)." The Act does, however, provide for a number of exemptions to this prohibition. For example, the elderly and disabled are permitted to use their food stamps to purchase home-delivered "meals on wheels" (7 U.S.C. Sec. 2012 (G)(4)). Another provision (7 U.S.C. Sec. 2012 (g)(3) allows elderly recipients of supplemental security income benefits (SSI) to use their food stamps to purchase prepared meals at non-profit establishments such as Senior Citizens Centers. In short, there are many precedents for the narrow exception we are recommending.

In further support of our position, I would like to submit for inclusion in the record a lengthy legal memorandum on the issue of using food stamps for cooked meals for the homeless which was prepared for Martha's Table by the law firm of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer, and Feld. The memorandum explores the legislative history, origins and reforms made in the Food Stamp Act as well as case law on the subject of food stamps used to purchase prepared meals. It notes the legislative trend toward increased "prepared meal" use of food stamps, including use of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

food stamps in meals on wheels programs, senior citizen and children feeding programs. Finally, the memorandum examines the possibility of amending the Food Stamp Act and the legal basis for creating a demonstration project to evaluate the effectiveness of a food stamp restaurant.

Benefits of the Program

The proposed amendment would benefit the nation in several ways. First, it would go a long way toward meeting the nutritional needs of the homeless. Second, it would enable non-profit organizations to meet those needs in an atmosphere that is respectful of the human dignity of homeless persons. Homelessness does not abrogate the individual's right to be treated with human dignity. Third, the concept of the food stamp restaurant promotes a cooperative relationship between the private and the public sector. Fourth, the proposed amendment is not intended to increase the cost to the federal government since the homeless already receive food stamps. Instead, it provides for a more effective use of those resources. Rather than forcing individuals to sell their food stamps for a fraction of face value on the "black market" in order to obtain cash with which to purchase prepared meals, the food stamp restaurant would provide a dollar for dollar return and enhance the efforts of legitimate non-profit organizations. Fifth, the availablity of meals at a

food stamp restaurant might indirectly facilitate solving the problem of homelessness, itself. Many non-profit groups might provide housing or shelter if they did not have to be concerned about the additional cost of providing meals for the homeless. And sixth, the food stamp restaurant could indirectly affect the employability of the individuals by becoming a place where prospective employers and employment programs could make contact with those in need of jobs.

Need for Congressional Action

We strongly believe that the proposed amendment is the most effective way to respond to the nutritional needs of the homeless, under existing programs. We would, therefore, urge the Select Committee to support the proposed amendment and the "food stamp restaurant" concept, embodied in it, and take whatever action it can to amend the Food Stamp Act. We would welcome the opportunity to assist the Committee in developing appropriate amendatory language.

Should, however, passage of such an amendment this session not be possible, we would recommend, that at the very least, the Congress direct the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a pliot project. We recognize that the Secretary, under 7 U.S.C. Sec. 2026 (b) (1) is authorized to "conduct, on a trial basis ... pilot or experimental projects designed to test program changes

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that might increase delivery of food stamp benefits to "eligible households." Moreover, he is able to waive requirements of the Act in order for a pilot project to be conducted, i.e. he could waive the provision prohibiting the use of food stamps to purchase "hot food products ready for immediate consumption." But having the authority does not guarantee that there is the will to use it.

In 1984 Martha's Table approached the USDA with a pilot project designed to test the food stamp restaurant concept. For a variety of reasons, the proposal was rejected. We suspect that the proposal was too broad in scope and may have lacked sufficient safeguards to ensure consistency with the fundamental policy of the Food Stamp Program. The original proposal was very brief and did not discuss many of the issues that may have been of concern to the Department of Agriculture. Martha's Table has developed a more refined proposal incorporating the concepts I have discussed. I would like to include a copy of the proposal for the record. We plan to submit the proposal to the Department of Agriculture in the near future, and we are hopeful it will receive favorable consideration. At the same time however, we feel that positive action by the Secretary is unlikely without an indication of Congressional support for this concept. I respectfully request that Members of this Committee review the proposal and provide us with any suggestions or advice you may have. We would, of course, be extremely grateful for your

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

endorsement of the proposal and any other assistance you could provide.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we would urge you, as the first line of action, to propose and support an amendment to the Food Stamp Act to allow the homeless to use their food stamps to purchase low cost hot meals prepared by non-profit organizations. If this is not feasible, during this Congressional session, at the very least, we would ask you to direct or encourage the Secretary of Agriculture to implement a pilot project which promotes the food stamp restaurant concept.

The problem of homelessness is real, and we can no longer afford to deny its reality. Resources, to respond on a longer term basis, are available, through existing programs and the private sector is willing to do its share. We are asking you to provide the means through which the private and public sector can cooperate, deal with this problem effectively.

Thank you for allowing me to appear. If I can be of any assistance in helping you to evaluate any matters affecting the homeless, please contact me.

59-645 0 - 86 - 8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dan Joseph
David Geanacopoulos

FROM: Thomas B. Smith

RE: Martha's Table Restaurant Proposal

DATE: June 15, 1984

---

This memorandum will discuss the legal issues raised by the proposal of Martha's Table to start a restaurant which would be authorized by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to accept food stamps in payment for meals served to the needy (proposal attached as exhibit 1). In particular, this memorandum will:

(1) Evaluate the existing authority of USDA to approve the Martha's Table restaurant to accept food stamps, both on a permanent basis and as a demonstration project;

(2) Present options for litigation to gain food stamp authorization for Martha's Table;

(3) Discuss legislative alternatives for the amendment of the Food Stamp Act to permit Martha's Table and/or similar institutions to offer meals to the needy and accept food stamps in payment; and

(4) Make conclusions and recommendations.

BEST AVAILABLE

Introduction and Summary

The original Food Stamp Act was enacted in 1964. Pub. L. No. 88-525, 78 Stat. 203 (1964). Evolving from a successful demonstration project underway since 1961, the program authorized under the Act provided for $75 million worth of coupons redeemable for food to be distributed to the poor across the country. The twin goals of the Act, which have continued to this day, were to[1] expand farm markets and[2] improve the diet of the poor. S. Rep. No. 1124, 88th Cong., 2nd Sess., reprinted in 1964 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 3288.

Throughout the history of the program, food stamps have not generally been accepted in restaurants or soup kitchens. As will be discussed below, there are several narrow exceptions to this rule, none of which provide USDA with explicit authority to approve the Martha's Table restaurant to accept food stamps in payment for meals served.

However, it is clear that the Martha's Table restaurant is appropriate for designation as a demonstration project. The Act authorizes the Secretary to approve pilot or experimental programs that would help achieve the goals of the food stamp program, and it expressly empowers the Secretary to waive requirements of the Act for this purpose. Despite the USDA letter of rejection, the legislative history of the prepared meal exceptions is unimportant in the consideration of demonstration project proposals; what matters is that the Martha's Table

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

restaurant would serve each and every purpose to which the food stamp program itself is committed and that it could provide a means to assist the homeless, a group not now adequately served by the program and for which there is currently very great concern.

If the Martha's Table Restaurant could be approved on an interim basis, time would be permitted for litigation or legislation to gain permanent authorization for the program. Both of these long term options are realistic, moreover, as (1) it is arguable that the eligibility classifications in the Act, which appear to penalize the homeless, do not satisfy the constitutional requirement of equal protection, thereby providing a good basis to challenge not the USDA but the Congress itself for its failure to permit equal program benefits for the homeless, and (2) over the past 15 years there has been a gradual expansion of the exceptions in the Act permitting the use of food stamps to purchase prepared meals, a trend which could facilitate efforts to convince the Congress to authorize Martha's Table to accept food stamps in its restaurant.

1. Present USDA Authority to Permit Food Stamp Use to Purchase Prepared Meals

In neither the Act nor its legislative history is there any significant support for the proposition that restaurants should be permitted to accept food stamps in payment for meals served. Nor is there any indication that soup kitchens or "restaurants for the needy" are to be treated any differently. In fact, all

relevant references in the Act and its legislative history indicate the Congress's desire not to permit food stamp redemption in eating establishments.

However, nowhere in the Act or its legislative history does the Congress explicitly and unequivocally state that food stamps are not to be used in restaurants, and only one reference in the legislative history could be found (dating to 1970) where the Congress indicated its intent not to permit food stamp use in soup kitchens. Furthermore, available case law on the question indicates that the Secretary may have some flexibility in the approval of prepared meal facilities, although this authority has likely been undercut by subsequent changes in the Act. Finally, and most importantly, the Secretary has specific authority under the Act to approve the Martha's Table restaurant on an interim basis as a demonstration project.

A. The Act

The Food Stamp Act itself is fairly explicit; stamps are intended to be used by recipients for the purchase of foods to be prepared and consumed at home, not for the purchase of restaurant food or prepared meals generally. Food stamps are issued to "eligible households", a term which encompasses both individuals and groups as long as food is customarily purchased and prepared for home consumption by the separate household unit. 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(i) (Supp. 1984). "[A]ny food or food product for home

COPY AVAILABLE

consumption" may be purchased except "alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and hot foods or hot food products ready for immediate consumption." 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(g) (Supp. 1984). Food stamps are to be used by recipients "only to purchase food in retail food stores which have been approved for participation" in the program by USDA; a retail food store is "an establishment . . . over 50 percentum of whose food sales volume consists of staple food items for home preparation and consumption." 7 U.S.C.S. §§ 2016, 2012(k)(Supp. 1984).

The Act provides for a number of exceptions to these narrow definitions which authorize the use of food stamps to purchase foods intended for neither home preparation nor home consumption. In particular, the Act permits (1) those over the age of 60 and those who are disabled (and their spouses) to use the food coupons to purchase home-delivered "meals-on-wheels", 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(g)(4) (Supp. 1984); (2) persons over 60 years of age or who receive supplemental security income benefits (and their spouses) to use food stamps to purchase meals in "public and private non-profit establishments . . . that feed such persons", 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(g)(3) (Supp. 1984); (3) alcoholics and drug addicts to pay for meals served to them in treatment centers using food stamps, 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(g)(5) (Supp. 1984), (4) disabled and blind recipients of Social Security benefits to use stamps to purchase meals in small centers certified by the state, 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(g)(7)(Supp. 1984), and (5) battered women and

NOT ONLY AVAILABLE

children to purchase meals in public or private non-profit shelters where they temporarily reside, 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(g)(8) (Supp. 1984). These exceptions have been added gradually to the Act over the past 15 years.1/ (See Section (3)(B) of this memorandum.)

The exceptions, however, are themselves very narrowly drawn and the fact that they exist at all lends further weight to the conclusion that the Act does not intend food stamps to be used for the purchase of prepared meals generally.

B. Legislative History

The legislative history of the Food Stamp Act provides no good enunciation of the rationale behind not permitting the use of food stamps in restaurants or other prepared meal settings. Nor does there emerge any clear indication of why such a policy would be adopted or even why the exceptions to the "prepared meal policy" were drawn so narrowly. See Everhart v. Knebel, 424 F.Supp. 390, 395 (D. Conn. 1976) (legislative history of the elderly/disabled meals-on-wheels exception "rather sparse"). Yet the history that does exist reinforces the view that Congress did

---

1/ In addition, Congress has authorized the use of food stamps to purchase equipment for procuring food by hunting and fishing in Alaska and "seeds and plants for use in gardens to produce for the personal consumption of the eligible household." 7 U.S.C.S. §§ 2012(g)(6), 2012(g)(2). Thus, persons with particular needs extending beyond bodily or psychological condition have been authorized to use food stamps to improve diets.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

not intend for food stamps to be used to purchase prepared meals generally.

The structure of the program was based largely on experimental and temporary "food coupon" programs dating back to the 1930's. S. Rep. No. 1124, 88th Cong., 2d Sess., reprinted in 1964 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 3276. Likely because restaurant dining at that time was considered an infrequent luxury and because a dollar spent in a restaurant would return a smaller percentage to the farmer than would a dollar spent in a grocery store, these early precursors to the food stamp program only permitted food stamp use in grocery stores. See 110 Cong. Rec. 14920 (1964)(statement of Mr. Douglas); Informational Leaflet No. 9, Pennsylvania Department of Welfare and U.S. Department of Agriculture, December 1962 ("You cannot use food coupons to buy 'lunch counter' or prepared foods for eating on the premises"). This policy was apparently incorporated without debate into the permanent Food Stamp Program upon its authorization in 1964.

In 1970 when the first exception to the prepared meal policy was adopted by the Congress, some indication of Congressional thinking on this policy was provided. According to the House Report accompanying the bill which eventually became law,

> The new subsection represents a significant expansion of the program. By authorizing persons 60 years of age or older . . . to use stamps to purchase meals prepared by and delivered to them by either a political subdivision or non-profit organization, the

> program seeks to reach the ill and incapacitated in a manner which was heretofore not authorized.

H.R. Rep. No. 1402, 91st Cong., 2d Sess., reprinted in 1970 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 6040. Inferred from this passage is the conclusion that absent this exception, no use of food stamps to purchase prepared meals by the elderly, disabled or others would be permitted.

In the same report, the House Committee expressed its intent to limit the exception just to the elderly and just to meals-on-wheels programs. The report also states that "the amendment is designed to preclude the use of stamps for the purchase of meals at soup kitchens regardless of their sponsorship." Id. at 6038.

In 1977 comprehensive reforms were made in the Food Stamp Act and a number of changes were made in the category of food eligibility. In discussing the original House proposal for food stamp reform, the Agriculture Committee cited, with apparent approval, a USDA definition of "ineligible items" which stated, in part, that the "Food Stamp Act provides that eligible foods are foods for home consumption. Therefore, prepared foods sold to be consumed on the premises of the firm are not eligible for purchase with food coupons." H.R. Rep. No. 464, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 325, reprinted in 1977 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 2260.

Principal among the changes made in the Act in 1977 concerning eligible foods was the ban on food stamp use for the purchase of "hot foods or hot food products ready for immediate

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

consumption" other than those specifically excepted through earlier amendments to the Act. Pub. L. No. 95-113, 91 Stat. 913 (codified as amended at 7 U.S.C.S. §2012(g)(1)(Supp. 1984)). This amendment appears to be a response to an argument raised in court by restaurants challenging USDA denial of "retail food store" designation to the effect that since retail stores could sell such foods to consumers, taking food stamps as payment, restaurants should be able to do so as well. See, e.g., Kentucky Fried Chicken v. United States, 449 F.2d 255 (5th Cir. 1971). In its report, the House Agriculture Committee explained its reasoning:

> The Committee bill bans the use of food stamps to purchase hot foods or hot food products ready for immediate consumption, unless they are part of meals served by commercial dining facilities, meals-on-wheels programs, or addict and alcoholic treatment centers. If the fast food stores, a majority of whose sales volume consists of food prepared to carry out or to be consumed on the premises . . . cannot redeem food stamps, the Committee thought that grocery stores should not be permitted an unfair sales advantage by being able to sell hot barbecue or chicken in return for food stamps.

H.R. Rep. 464, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 333, reprinted in 1977 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 2268. In the 1977 reform package, the Congress also added to the definition of retail food store the requirement that the food it sold be intended for home preparation as well as consumption. 7 U.S.C.S. §2012(k)(1). This amendment appears to have been designed to serve the same purpose as the change in the definition of "food" discussed above.

In sum, although the legislative history of the Food Stamp Act contains no direct and unequivocal repudiation of the use of food stamps to purchase prepared meals, all available indications are that this is the policy Congress intended. In addition, the lone reference to the subject indicates that at least the House Agriculture Committee's intent in 1970 was to bar the use of food stamps in soup kitchens. Thus on the basis of both the language of the Act and its legislative history, there does not appear to be sufficient statutory authority for USDA to approve, on a permanent basis, the receipt of food stamps by a "restaurant for the needy" in payment for meals served.

C. Case Law

The number of cases decided on the question of food stamp use to purchase prepared meals is surprisingly limited. While the existing cases do indicate that there might be sufficient discretionary authority available to USDA to approve the use of food stamps by recipients in low-cost facilities serving nutritious meals composed of staple foods, changes in the Act since these cases were decided have largely undercut any possible authority of this nature.

The issue of using food stamps to purchase restaurant food did not arise until 1970, when a Kentucky Fried Chicken franchise in Cleveland, Mississippi brought a declaratory judgment action against USDA for the Department's rejection of its "retail food

AVAILABLE

store" application. Reversing the district court, the 5th Circuit upheld the Department's determination of ineligibility, stating that the Secretary has the authority to approve only those retail food stores which effectuate the purposes of the food stamp program, i.e. to improve diets of the poor. Thus the Secretary did not abuse his discretion in denying approval to a retail food store applicant which "sold only a limited variety of high-cost prepared foods." Kentucky Fried Chicken, 449 F.2d at 257. Other decisions subsequently upheld the Secretary's authority to exclude stores selling primarily luxury-type food items instead of basic staple foods. Williamson v. Butz, 438 F.Supp. 126 (E.D.N.C. 1977); Capricorn Coffees Inc. v. Butz, 432 F.Supp. 917 (N.D. Cal. 1977).

From these cases an inference might be drawn that the Secretary would be abusing his discretion if he prohibited the use of food stamps for the purchase of prepared meals that were low in cost and which consisted of basic staple commodities, or at least that the Secretary possessed the authority to approve such an establishment. Before 1977, a strong argument could have been advanced for this position. However, because the changes made that year barring food stamp use for the purchase of ready-to-consume foods and adding the requirement that foods purchased

be produced in the home, this argument loses most of its strength.2/

D. Demonstration Project

The Food Stamp Act authorizes the Secretary to "conduct, on a trial basis . . . pilot or experimental projects designed to test program changes that might increase the efficiency of the food stamp program and improve the delivery of food stamp benefits to eligible households." 7 U.S.C.S. § 2026(b)(1) (Supp. 1984). For this purpose the Act explicitly authorizes the Secretary to "waive

---

2/ While one avenue of authority might remain open to the Secretary with respect to a food stamp restaurant proposal, this path would require substantial contortion of the Act. While the Act requires that foods sold be for "home" consumption and that 50 percent of retail food store sales volume be staple foods for home preparation, an argument might be raised that for all practical purposes the restaurant is the "home" of the patrons served (indigents) and thus the food sold to them there qualifies under the Act. To avoid the prohibition on hot foods "ready for immediate consumption" added in 1977, the restaurant could limit its menu to cold foods. Although a strained reading of the Act is required, such an approach is at least plausible. Furthermore, there is no question but that each and every policy goal of the Act is achieved through the restaurant for the needy approach.

Trouble arises, however, in the definition of household eligibility. While individuals who live alone qualify as households, 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(i)(Supp. 1984), those who "live with others and pay compensation to the others for meals" do not. Id. If the restaurant is "home" and others "live" there, the indigent is not a household and thus is not eligible. Further straining of the Act is required to circumvent this problem (e.g. the "others" who are paid compensation are not the same "others" with whom the indigent lives; the money/food stamps paid is not compensation but merely a donation).

BEST AVAILABLE

the requirements of this Act to the degree necessary for such projects to be conducted." Id.

This section could be invoked by the Secretary to authorize the Martha's Table restaurant to accept food stamps in payment for the meals furnished to the needy. By the words of the Act, both a failure to fall within one of the prepared meal exceptions and the legislative history of the exceptions in general are irrelevant; what is important is that delivery of food stamp benefits to the needy will be improved. Especially if the project is framed as a means to provide food assistance to a presently underserved segment of the needy population, the homeless, the Martha's Table restaurant proposal would be appropriate for designation as a demonstration project.

Thus while the Act, its legislative history, and the case law do not provide support for the Secretary to approve the Martha's Table restaurant to receive food stamps in payment for meals on an ongoing basis, the Act would clearly permit such a program as a pilot project. As will be discussed in the Conclusions and Recommendations section of this memorandum, pursuing this alternative likely presents the best option for Martha's Table and the needy in Washington.

2. Litigation Options

Based on the "plain meaning" of the Act, it is clear that food to be sold to food stamp recipients is that which is to be prepared

and consumed in the home and that if an individual has no permanent residence and possesses no adequate cooking facilities he is placed at a severe disadvantage by the restrictions in the Act. Technically, if he lives alone and satisfies the income and asset requirement for eligibility he may obtain food stamps, but since he can not use these stamps to purchase hot foods ready for consumption either at dining facilities or in supermarkets, and since his lack of refrigeration facilities prevents him from purchasing foods requiring cold storage, he is far less able to obtain a nutritionally balanced diet than is an eligible household with adequate food preparation facilities. In the sense that the Act directly penalizes the homeless through its restrictions on foods that can be purchased and the stores which can sell to them, and also in the sense that the Act provides exceptions to these restrictions for some classes of persons who are unable to prepare meals for themselves, but not for those who are equally disadvantaged by a lack of cooking facilities entirely, the Act appears to discriminate and deny equal protection to the homeless.

In the case law there is some support for this proposition. In United States Department of Agriculture v. Moreno, 413 U.S. 528 (1973), the Court invalidated, on equal protection grounds, a provision then in the Act that barred any household composed of unrelated individuals from receiving food stamps. The Court found that this proscription was not rationally related to any legitimate governmental purpose. Similarly, to the extent the present

BEST AVAILABLE

restriction on food stamp use in prepared meal facilities prevents otherwise eligible persons from obtaining nutritious meals composed of staple foods, it is arguable that no rational purpose is served and that the goals of the Act are contravened.

With respect to the exceptions to the prepared meal policy provided to certain groups, but not the homeless generally, it is not clear that the "line" drawn by Congress is rationally supportable. The Act is specifically intended to "safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's population by raising levels of nutrition among low-income households." 7 U.S.C.S. §2011 (1978). Yet by denying the homeless, who have no adequate food storage or preparation facilities, the ability to use their food stamps to purchase low-cost nutritious meals, exactly the opposite may result. Furthermore, while the exceptions to the prepared meal prohibition were adopted to accomodate the special needs of (1) groups unable to prepare meals at home (elderly and disabled), (2) those who reside in special treatment centers with no access to cooking facilities (alcoholics, drug addicts and battered women) and (3) people with non-physical or non-psychological problems (Alaskans and gardeners), it would seem to follow that an exception should be extended to the homeless. See Everhart v. Knebel, 424 F.Supp. 390 (D. Conn. 1976) (limitation that persons using food stamps to purchase meals-on-wheels be elderly and disabled not rationally supported; food stamp users who are disabled but not elderly should be eligible as well).

3. Legislative Alternatives for the Amendment of the Food Stamp Act

Although the rationale is hazy, the plain meaning of the Food Stamp Act is that coupons are not intended to be used for the purchase of prepared meals, except in a number of narrowly confined circumstances. However, the Food Stamp Act could be amended to authorize the Martha's Table restaurant to accept stamps in payment for the meals it serves to the needy.

A. Approach

Amendments could be made in a number of forms: Martha's Table could specifically be approved as a "retail food store" within the meaning of the Act, or the institution could be authorized in a generic sense, thus permitting other charitable groups like Martha's Table to conduct similar programs. The general clauses of the Act could be amended so as to not exclude the Martha's Table restaurant concept, or the restaurant could be authorized as another exception to the general bar to the use of food stamps to purchase prepared meals.

It appears that since the Congress has generally chosen to maintain the broad brush language about "home consumption and preparation" and authorize individual institutions through exceptions, this would be the preferred approach.

In order for the food stamp restaurant to meet the goals of the Act, and to eliminate the potential for food stamp use in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

commercial restaurants, the exception would have to be narrowly tailored. Enunciation of a legislative purpose would also be required; here such justification would clearly be assistance for a presently underserved segment of the needy population eligible for food stamps, the homeless. As much as possible, the new exception should track language in the Act generally as well as applicable language in the other exceptions. Language in the form of the exception would have to be added to the definitions of "food", 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(g) and "retail food store", 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(k).

Possible language for these terms under the Act includes:

(a) "food": "(9) in the case of the homeless or those without adequate food storage or preparation facilities, meals prepared for and served to them by approved public or private non-profit eating facilities."

(b) "retail food store": "an approved eating facility which serves, at concessional prices, nutritious meals composed of staple foods to those without adequate food storage or preparation facilities as described in subsection (g)(9) of this section."

In addition to legislation authorizing a new exception in the Act, legislation could be pursued instructing the Department to conduct a demonstration project with Martha's Table. While such legislation would be desirable, it would likely be sufficient to gain endorsements from the Agriculture Committees for

the project and, better yet, to obtain language in the report for the upcoming Agriculture Appropriations bill instructing the Secretary to conduct the project. (See Conclusions and Recommendations.)

B. Legislative Trend Toward Increased "Prepared Meal" Use of Food Stamps

Over the past 15 years the number of exceptions to the general policy of not allowing the redemption of food stamps in restaurants or for the purchase of prepared meals has increased gradually. These exceptions have all been designed to provide assistance to individual groups for whose welfare the Congress has become concerned and not for the poor or hungry generally; on at least one occasion the authorizing Committee has specifically repudiated a broadening of the exceptions to include "soup kitchens". Nevertheless, the growth in the number of exceptions added to the Act does demonstrate the Congress' continued willingness to use these exceptions to provide increased food assistance to needy groups and it provides a valuable tool with which to convince the Congress that an additional exception designed to accomodate Martha's Table should be adopted.

(i) 1970 Amendment Permits Food Stamp Use for "Meals-on-Wheels"

The first exception to the requirement that food stamps be redeemed only in "retail food stores" was enacted in 1970. In

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that year a new subsection was added to the 1964 Act through which food stamp recipients over the age of 60 were permitted to use their coupons to "purchase meals prepared by and delivered to them" by local government agencies or non-profit charitable organizations, provided that the elderly food stamp recipients were "disabled" to the extent they could not prepare their own meals and provided that the preparer operated within the spirit of the Act and did not use federally donated foods. Pub. L. No. 91-671 § (5)(c), 84 Stat. 2048 (1970); H.R. Rep. No. 1402, 91st. Cong., 2d Sess, reprinted in 1970 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 6040.3/ Conforming changes were made in the definitions of "food" (to include meals-on-wheels) and "retail food store" (to include meal providers) in the 1964 Act.

(ii) 1973 Changes Allow Food Stamp Redemption by Elderly in Communal Dining Facilities and by Alcoholics and Drug Addicts in Treatment Centers

In the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, the Congress added more significant exceptions to the general bar to

3/ The restrictions placed on this exception caused the measure to come under attack by Members who saw the exception as a means to combat "the psychological barriers to good nutrition, including the elderly's particular need for companionship while eating." Dissenting remarks of Hon. Thomas S. Foley and Hon. Allard Lowenstein to H.R. Rep. No. 1402, reprinted in 1970 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News at 6046. These two Members recommended that non-profit groups be permitted to serve the elderly "low-cost, nutritionally sound meals in conveniently located centers outside the home, such as schools" for this purpose. Id. This change was adopted in 1973.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the use of food stamps to purchase prepared meals. Through that Act the Congress authorized the elderly (those over the age of 60 years and their spouses) to use their food stamps to purchase meals prepared by senior citizen centers, apartment buildings occupied primarily by the elderly, schools and any "public or non-profit private eating establishment which prepares meals especially for elderly persons during special hours, and any other public or non-profit private establishment approved for such purpose by the Secretary." Pub. L. 93-86 § (3)(k), 87 Stat. 221 (1973).

In addition, the Congress authorized alcoholics and drug addicts eligible to receive food stamps to use the coupons to purchase food prepared for them by treatment programs. Pub. L. 93-86, § (3)(f). As in 1970, conforming changes were made in the definitions of "food" and "retail food store". In addition, the definition of "household" was modified to include homes for the elderly and treatment centers; persons in such facilities would otherwise be excluded as residents of institutions. 7 U.S.C.S. § 2012(i) (Supp. 1984).

(iii) 1977 Act Expands Exception to Permit Food Stamp Use by Handicapped to Purchase Meals Delivered to Homes

The Food and Agriculture Act of 1977 further expanded the prepared meals exception. That Act authorized persons under 60 years of age (including children) who were otherwise eligible for

AVAILABLE

food stamps to purchase home-delivered meals with the coupons if they were by age or otherwise physically or mentally handicapped so that they could not prepare their own meals. Eligibility would be determined by the appropriate caseworker. Pub. L. No. 95-113, 91 Stat. 959 (1977); H.R. Rep. No. 464, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 322-23, reprinted in 1977 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 2257-58. See Everhart, 424 F. Supp. at 396 (prior requirement of elderly and disabled denies equal protection to the disabled under the age of 60; Act changed soon after).

(iv) 1979 Amendments Authorize Social Security Recipients to use Food Stamps to Purchase Communal Meals

The Food Stamp Amendments of 1979 authorized blind and disabled people receiving Social Security disability payments or supplemental security income benefits and residing in special centers of not more than 16 persons to use food stamps to purchase meals. These changes were precipitated by alterations in food stamp eligibility and benefit rules legislated in 1977 which were "causing severe hardship among elderly and disabled recipients with high medical and shelter expenses." S. Rep. No. 236, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. 2, reprinted in 1979 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 940. As with previous amendments to the prepared meals exception, conforming changes were made in the "food", "retail food store" and "household" definitions.

(v) 1980 Marks Final Expansion of Exception to Include Shelters for Battered Women and Children

Through the Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1980, Congress authorized the use of food stamps to purchase meals in shelters that prepare and serve meals to battered women and children. Pub. L. 96-249, 94 Stat. 357 (1980). If the women and children were otherwise eligible for food stamps, the coupons could be used in the shelters.

A significant inducement to the expansion of the prepared meal exception to cover such shelters was the fact that the Congress had, the previous session, authorized federal assistance for community-based shelters for battered women and children. "Permitting such shelters to receive food stamps if the women and their children who stayed in the shelters were food stamp recipients would assure nutritious meals for the women as well as reduce operating costs for the shelters." H.R. Rep. No. 788, 96th Cong., 2d Sess. 148, reprinted in 1980 U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 981-82.

This expansion is also significant in the sense that unlike centers for substance abusers or for the blind or disabled, the battered women shelters are not licensed or certified by the state or a federal agency. Individual certification by food stamp offices, much like the retail food store approval process, was thus authorized. Id.

In sum, each of the groups for whom food stamp use to puchase prepared meals has been permitted has been a vulnerable

AVAILABLE

group about which the Congress and the Administration has become concerned. For each, it has been made clear that the structure of the food stamp program has not adequately met its needs and special conditions. These arguments are equally applicable to the homeless.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the plain meaning of the Act and what relevant legislative history is available, it seems clear that the Secretary has no explicit authority to approve, on a permanent basis, the food stamp restaurant project as proposed by Martha's Table. While the existing case law on the subject indicates that the Secretary might have enough discretionary authority to approve the use of food stamps to purchase low-cost meals composed of staple foods from non-profit benevolent organizations, recent changes in the Act have almost certainly undercut these arguments. The Martha's Table restaurant could be authorized as a demonstration project, however, and either litigation or legislation (albeit on a somewhat longer time line) could be used to pursue more permanent authority.

A. The Demonstration Project Approach

Status as a demonstration project would authorize the Martha's Table restaurant to operate on an interim basis and would involve study by the Department and the Congress of how

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

well the restaurant achieved the objectives of the Food Stamp Act.

According to the Act, the Secretary has broad authority to conduct pilot or experimental projects that could "increase the efficiency of the food stamp program and improve the delivery of food stamp benefits to eligible households." 7 U.S.C.S. § 2026(b)(1) (Supp. 1984). The Martha's Table restaurant proposal satisfies the spirit of this section and complies with the general policies and goals of the Act. In particular, the Martha's Table restaurant would:

(1) Promote the health and well-being of the Nation's population by raising levels of nutrition among low income households. 7 U.S.C.S. §2011 (1978).

(2) Promote the distribution of the Nation's agricultual abundance. Id.

(3) Enable low income households to obtain more nutritious diets through offering meals prepared from staple foods. Id.; 7 U.S.C.S. §2012(k)(1).

(4) Offer meals to the poor at low cost. See Kentucky Fried Chicken, 449 F.2d at 257.

(5) Not increase the cost of the food stamp program as additional stamps would not be issued; only the number of locations where stamps could be redeemed would be increased. See Everhart, 424 F.Supp. at 395.

(6) Would be conducted in Washington, D.C. where careful observation by the Department could be maintained.

BEST AVAILABLE

In addition, Martha's Table easily meets all 3 criteria for approval of retail food stores for the acceptance of food stamps. Participation of Martha's Table will effectuate the purposes of the food stamp program, the food business conducted will be directed only at the needy and will provide basic staple foods, within a short period of time the restaurant volume can be expected to be significant, and the business integrity and reputation of the group's organizers is unimpeachable. 7 U.S.C.S. § 2018(a).

The procedures for approval of a demonstration project are found at 7 C.F.R. §§ 282.4, 282.5. There is nothing in these procedures which indicates that Martha's Table proposal would be ineligible or have difficulty gaining approval. While review of all proposals by an expert panel is required, it does not appear that this is a formalistic or time-consuming. A proposal satisfying specified requirements is required, as is a 30-day public comment period before a demonstration project begins.

In short, despite initial USDA rejection, it appears that the most expeditious way that Martha's Table can begin operation is as a demonstration project. Further research on a follow-up demonstration project proposal to USDA and the development of a program to gain Administration and Congressional support is recommended.

PROPOSAL FOR A FOOD STAMP PILOT PROJECT

Introduction

Martha's Table, a non-profit, charitable organization serving the needy in Washington, D.C. seeks authority to conduct a pilot project in which homeless food stamp recipients would be permitted to use their coupons to purchase low-cost nutritious prepared meals. This project is designed to improve the delivery of food stamp benefits to the homeless, a group which is largely unable to take advantage of the intended benefits of the food stamp program.

The Administration, Congress and the private sector have all expressed increased concern about the problems of the homeless. This proposed project seeks to address one of those problems -- the nutritional needs of the homeless. Although the homeless are eligible for food stamps, they are effectively prevented from participating in the program. This is because the Food Stamp Act currently restricts food stamp use to the purchase of food from grocery stores for home preparation and consumption. Because the homeless lack adequate food storage and preparation facilities, the nutrition assistance made available through the program is denied to these individuals. Those who do participate in the program sometimes are forced to sell their food stamps for a fraction of their face value on the "black market" in order to obtain cash with which to purchase prepared meals. Therefore, the policy goal of the Act, to promote the health and well-being of the nation's impoverished, is frustrated.

AVAILABLE

Authority for a Pilot Project

Food stamps are issued to "eligible households" for use in the purchase of food for "home consumption" from "retail food stores." 7 U.S.C. § 2012. However, food stamps may not be used to purchase "hot foods or hot food products ready for immediate consumption." 7 U.S.C. § 2012(g). Nevertheless, the Act provides for a number of exceptions to this prohibition. For example, the elderly and disabled are permitted to use their food stamps to purchase home-delivered "meals-on-wheels." 7 U.S.C. § 2012(g)(4). Another exception permits elderly recipients of supplemental security income benefits (SSI) to use their food stamps to purchase prepared meals at non-profit establishments, such as Senior Citizens centers. 7 U.S.C. § 2012(g)(3).

The Food Stamp Act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to "conduct, on a trial basis . . . pilot or experimental projects designed to test program changes that might increase delivery of food stamp benefits to eligible households." 7 U.S.C. § 2026(b)(1). The Act explicitly authorizes the Secretary to waive the requirements of the Act, if necessary, in order for a pilot project to be conducted. Thus, although the Act prohibits the use of food stamps to purchase "hot food products ready for immediate consumption," the Secretary may waive this prohibition so that the proposed pilot project may be conducted.

Goals of the Pilot Project

The Martha's Table pilot project is designed to test program changes that might increase the delivery of food stamps benefits

to the homeless, a currently underserved target population. In particular, the project will test whether:

(1) providing low-cost nutritious prepared meals is an effective means of ensuring that the homeless are able to take advantage of the intended benefits of the food stamp program;

(2) the homeless will take advantage of the opportunity to use their food stamps to purchase low-cost nutritious meals;

(3) the availability of nutritious prepared meals will encourage the homeless to participate in the food stamp program;

(4) a prepared meal facility can serve as a focal point for nutrition education, as well as other health or education programs;

(5) a prepared meal facility will help efforts to combat other problems of the homeless, such as their isolation;

(6) the availability of prepared meals will encourage the homeless to participate in the food stamp program;

(7) the program can effectively be limited to the homeless; and

(8) there would be a significant budgetary impact on the food stamp program if a "prepared meal exemption" for the homeless, similar to the current exemption for the elderly, were added to the Act.

Background on the Project Applicant

Martha's Table is a nonprofit organization which provides a variety of services to the needy residents of Washington, D.C. Martha's Table currently feeds the needy through two very successful programs: a mobile nutrition program and a soup kitchen for children. McKenna's Wagon, a converted ice cream truck, delivers meals seven nights a week to several locations .n

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the District where the homeless congregate. The Martha's Table soup kitchen for children operates in space the organization leases at 2124 14th Street, N.W. The organization operates a professional kitchen at that location, where it prepares the food for distribution at the soup kitchen and by McKenna's Wagon. The kitchen has adequate refrigeration and cooking facilities and meets local health and sanitation code requirements. A former professional chef, assisted by volunteers, runs the kitchen.

Martha's Table was founded in 1981 by Dr. Veronica Maz, a former Georgetown University sociology professor, who still heads the organization. Dr. Maz has testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture about the nutritional needs of the homeless and poor.

The Pilot Project

Martha's Table proposes a pilot project in which homeless food stamp recipients will be served nutritious prepared meals at the organization's rented headquarters. The participants will use their food stamps to pay for their meals. Food stamp identification will be required to certify that each patron is homeless and that he is using his own stamps.[1/] The cost of each meal will be limited to $1.00.

---

1/ Under District of Columbia regulations, homeless individuals who meet the eligibility requirements may receive food stamps. Because these individuals have no permanent address they receive their food stamps through approved shelters which are identified on their food stamp I.D. cards. By requiring presentation of these I.D. cards at the meal site, Martha's Table will be able to limit the program to those are in fact homeless.

The Martha's Table headquarters has an area measuring 40 feet by 80 feet which can be converted into a seating area. The area can hold up to 100 people at one time. The facility will be open daily for the evening meal (between 4:00 and 7:00 p.m.).

All food served at the facility will be purchased commercially or received through the Martha's Table donor network. No surplus USDA commodities will be used. Martha's Table will not profit from the sale of the meals to the homeless. Nor will any federal funds be used for food preparation or administrative costs. All food preparation and administrative tasks will be performed by Martha's Table staff and volunteers.

Evaluation

The pilot project will be conducted over an 18-month period. Throughout the project's term, Martha's Table will work closely with USDA Food and Nutrition Service staff to ensure that the Department is kept fully apprised of the project's operation. Martha's Table will keep accurate records of the numbers of homeless individuals who take advantage of the opportunity to use their food stamps to purchase the prepared meals. Martha's Table will prepare interim written reports during the course of the project. At the conclusion of the 18-month period, a full report will be compiled evaluating the success of the project in meeting the needs of the homeless. In addition, Martha's Table will analyze the potential impact on the food stamp program if the project were authorized on a permanent basis.

Conclusion

Last year, Martha's Table submitted a proposal for a food stamp demonstration project which the Department denied. That proposal was far broader in scope and less well-defined than this proposal. In particular, that proposal was not limited to the homeless.

The pilot project which Martha's Table is now proposing directly addresses the nutrition needs of the homeless. There is a critical need for such a project at this time, in light of the growing concern about how best to provide assistance to the homeless. Martha's Table believes that the pilot project which it proposes will ascertain whether the provision of low-cost nutritious prepared meals is an effective means of assisting the homeless through the food stamp program. Martha's Table will provide any additional information about this proposal which would assist the Department in its consideration.

AVAILABLE

Trevor's Campaign
**A PROGRAM OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT**

Introduction

In December of 1983, a local television news report touched the heart of 11 year old Trevor Ferrell. The report showed the plight of the homeless who live on the streets and steam vents of Philadelphia. Rather than just watch with pity, Trevor took action. He asked his parents to drive him through the streets of the city in order to find someone in need of his extra blanket and pillow. The love exchanged that first night, between just one person in need and this young boy, formed the foundation for what has since developed into a major effort of personal support and caring.

Trevor's original act was rapidly followed by additional family journeys to the city. This boy's courage and caring began to attract regional, then national media attention. Trevor's story has touched thousands of people across the country, and each day this compassion moves more and more individuals to contribute in some way to the support of these homeless. Perhaps it is the image of "a child shall lead them" which has generated such a powerful response; perhaps it is the simple direct way in which Trevor gives of himself; perhaps it is a reawakening of peoples' inherent good and willingness to give of themselves. Whatever the reasons, Trevor's simple act of compassion has sparked a major movement.

In May of 1984, Trevor's Campaign joined Resources for Human Development, Incorporated, a diversified non-profit tax-exempt corporation. The central offices for the corporation are located in Ardmore, Pennsylvania. The corporation develops and sponsors a variety of service programs responding to a broad spectrum of human and social needs. Currently, Resources for Human Development, Inc. operates approximately seventy-five (75) different programs, most in the Delaware Valley, although certain programs have regional and national scope.

Now, over one hundred street people receive nightly visits from Trevor, his parents, and other community volunteers. Each night, driving through the streets of Philadelphia in a donated old blue van, Trevor and his friends give away warm meals, used clothing, blankets, pillows, and most importantly, companionship and caring. Over seventy volunteer families share the task of cooking the meals and sorting the donated items. Local businesses have joined Trevor's Campaign by donating food, clothing, and good will.

Now, seventeen former street people are living in an old center city rooming house donated to Trevor's Campaign by a local church. Emergency electrical, roof, and plumbing repairs have been made possible through the generosity of individual contributions. Having a permanent address has allowed these formerly homeless individuals to qualify for governmental aid programs, improve their physical health, gain a sense of personal security, and find a new identity and sense of optimism.



59-645 0 - 86 - 9

Trevor's Campaign
A PROGRAM OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

Thousands of individuals from all 50 states have sent letters of appreciation, small financial contributions, and stories of their own personal involvement and caring. These people have reached out to become part of something larger than their individual personal involvement, and they have found strength, recognition, and encouragement for their own caring acts. They are providing moral support not only to Trevor's efforts, but to their own efforts and the efforts of the many people like them. Requests have been received from people across the nation asking how they might help Trevor's Campaign and how they might help the needy in their own community.

Now Trevor's Campaign seeks to expand its services: creating more street feeding routes; increasing the capacity of the house; and, formalizing the support and communication offered to volunteers and care givers around the country.

The success of Trevor's Campaign lies in its simplicity: when a person is hungry and cold, give food and clothing; when a person is sick or disturbed, arrange health care; when a person is homeless, give shelter; when a person needs to know someone cares, love them.

The following describes the current activities and plans of Trevor's Campaign: the local street feeding program; the local housing program; and, the national campaign of volunteer recognition and support. The Campaign's needs are many, and the Campaign's potential is great, and most important, we need your support.

## PHILADELPHIA FEEDING PROGRAM

There are an estimated 10,000 individuals living on the streets of Philadelphia: without shelter, employment, food, or friends. While many of these individuals experience some level of physical or mental impairment, many others are among the "new poor" because of unemployment. Many of these people are without adequate skills or training to find jobs even when employment is available.

Trevor's Campaign for Philadelphia's Homeless is designed to mobilize a variety of resources (food, clothing, blankets, health care, ancillary support services, friendship, hope), and distribute these resources in the simplest and most direct way possible. In essence, the more formal campaign that has now emerged, involving many volunteers, is committed to the simplicity of Trevor's original act.

While there is currently only one food delivery route, Trevor's Campaign hopes to establish two additional food delivery routes by the spring of 1985. To expand the number of food routes in Philadelphia is really a very simple process. It requires the recruitment of additional volunteer families to prepare the food and the acquisition of additional vehicles to enable the delivery. At this expanded level of activity, an increased level of coordination will be necessary to maintain the overall effort.



BEST AVAILABLE

Trevor's Campaign
A PROGRAM OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

We will seek direction from city officials as to which neighborhoods are least tended in terms of current city or independent organizational support, so that we can focus the Campaign on these efforts. However, we are not asking for direct governmental funding. Many of the street people are often too confused or frightened to make use of the services offered by established agencies. Expending governmental funds necessarily requires rules, regulations, and forms often shunned by the street person because of their formality. Trevor's Campaign is designed to keep the process as simple and as personal as possible.

## PHILADELPHIA HOUSING PROGRAM

Most of the people currently living on the streets of Philadelphia are not doing so by choice, but because of a lack of viable alternatives. Existing shelters in the city are overcrowded, typically available only on a short-term basis, and may be too overwhelming to some of the street people. Without legal addresses, these individuals cannot qualify for the various forms of aid offered by government agencies. Being on the street causes a vast range of problems, from poor personal security and safety, to inadequate medical attention and further deterioration of often severe emotional disturbances. Trevor's Housing Program provides a viable alternative "A permanently residence for the homeless."

While we recognize that local government is making an effort to house a number of dependent street people, Trevor's housing program will depend on the private sector, utilizing volunteer services, donated goods, and charitable contributions from individuals, corporations, and foundations.

A facility has been made available called Trevor's Place. This house, located on Poplar Street in Philadelphia, contains 33 bedrooms and 19 bathrooms, and when refurbished will house as many as 100 individuals should sufficient funding and staffing be available. Currently, basic renovations are underway to help the facility meet the various city housing code requirements. Seventeen former street people are living in the house and assisting in the basic renovations. This involvement of the street person in the care of themselves and others is an important part of the Campaign.

As the necessary larger scale funding becomes available for Trevor's Place, specific staffing patterns and support services will be implemented, allowing more needy individuals to begin living permanently in the facility.

## PHILADELPHIA MEDICAL PROGRAM

Trevor's concern has taken on still another dimension, "the medical needs of the homeless." Since February 1985, regularly scheduled medical check-ups and hospitalization, when needed, for the residents of Trevor's Place, is being provided free of charge through a cooperative effort with Saint Joseph's Hospital.

The medical program also includes assistance with medication, as well professional psychological counseling and rehabilitation.

Currently, there are plans for a wellness program to provide medical screening and follow-up referrals including hospitalization for the thousands who live on the streets, utilizing a community health mobile.

## NATIONAL VOLUNTEER SUPPORT AND RECOGNITION PROGRAM

Throughout the United States there are people in need. The problems they experience range from immobility associated with aging, to the destitute nature of the street person; from short-lived emotional crisis to permanent physical and mental disability. Many of these people have some form of support networks which are usually quite simple and quite personal: the neighbor who drives to the store; the friend who calls frequently; the church group which sponsors a tutoring program or a clothing give-away; the community that rallies to a family in need after a house fire; the child who helps the elderly neighbor with household chores. These activities are all beautiful examples of human caring, yet they rarely receive the local or national recognition they deserve. Although all of these acts are individually motivated by their intrinsic value and personal meaning, larger recognition and identity can help sustain and expand the efforts. Trevor's Campaign has started providing this recognition, celebration, and identification with others sharing this same sense of commitment to direct and simple human caring. The Campaign can and will help to encourage individuals to keep up their good works. The Campaign can also bring individuals together in groups to dream, plan, and attempt acts of caring that alone they might not be able to accomplish.

Members of the Campaign are receiving a regularly published newsletter containing news of Trevor's Campaign's activities in Philadelphia, and stories of caring activities by Campaign members throughout the country. The Campaign will review the letters and stories sent in by members. These letters and stories will not only be used for the Campaign's newsletter, but will be prepared for issue to local, regional, and national media, including newspapers, magazines, television, and radio.

Members will also be able to call Campaign Headquarters to receive technical assistance and personal reassurance from our staff. They may ask questions related to the implementation of their own specific activities, ask about the efforts of others they may have read about in the newsletter, or ask about additional technical resources available on a local, regional, or national basis.

## VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORT

A wide network of supporters and volunteers are deeply involved in making the Campaign vision a reality. The continued utilization of volunteer staff is a necessary factor in the success of Trevor's Campaign. Among those who have offered their services are skilled management consultants, lawyers, group facilitators, cooks, drivers, and others who simply care.

Trevor's Campaign
A PROGRAM OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

Over eighty families share the responsibility of preparing meals for the Philadelphia street people feeding program each month. A smaller group of volunteers share the responsibility to distribute this food each night, with many of the volunteers developing close and caring relationships with individual street people who look forward to their arrival.

Local companies have shown their continuing support through the regular provision of services and the donation of supplies for the street feeding program, including:

- o McDonalds Restaurant
  Daily donation of food from Conshohocken location;
- o Seven-Eleven Food Stores
  Daily donation of coffee for food runs
- o Super Fresh Supermarket
  Daily donation of food from Gladwyne store; and,
- o Tracy Hotel
  Bi-weekly donation of food.
- o Villanova College
  Weekly donation of food; and,
- o WYSP Radio Station - 94 FM
  Publicity for Trevor's Campaign

Valuable advisors have focused much of their expertise and energy on the Campaign, among them are:

- o Alfred Burns, Partner
  Dechert Price and Rhoads
- o Franca Palumbo, Attorney
  Dechert Price and Rhoads
- o Henry Winsor, Vice-President
  Butcher & Singer
- o Morris Longstreth, Therapist
  Horizon House
- o Rev. Howard Friend, Pastor
  Gladwyne Presbyterian Church

There has been continual and positive response to Trevor's Campaign from the Philadelphia area and from groups and individuals around the country. The Ferrell family has been making guest appearances every week to share their vision and their experience. All of the Philadelphia area television stations have devoted news and special coverage programs to Trevor's Campaign. Special Reports and interviews have been aired in Cleveland, Boston, and Lancaster, Pennsylvania. In addition, Trevor has been seen nationally on ABC's "Good Morning America", NBC's Today Show", Group W's "Evening Magazine", the syndicated program "Entertainment Tonight", and world wide on CBN's "The 700 Club".

The Philadelphia Inquirer has provided generous news coverage of the campaign. Other stories have been written by:

- o New York Times;
- o Boston Globe;
- o USA Today;
- o The National Globe;
- o Associated Press;
- o United Press;
- o People Magazine; and,
- o McCall's Magazine.

Trevor Ferrell has received many awards and commendations for his direct and caring actions, including:

- o Award of Appreciation, American Legion;
- o Citizen of the Year, Bala Cynwyd Neighborhood Association;
- o City of Buffalo Award, Buffalo, New York;
- o Hall of Fame Award, National Senior Citizens;
- o Rotarian Award, Rotary Clubs International;
- o Special Recognition Award, U.S. Congressman, Lawrence Coughlin;
- o Outstanding Humanitarian Service, B'nai B'rith;
- o Resolution #28, Philadelphia City Council;
- o Merit for Humanitarian Service, Club Cornicopia;
- o "Trevor Ferrell Day", Plainfield, New Jersey;
- o "Pop Warner Award" Pop Warner Organization;
- o "International Integrity Award", The John Roger Foundation;
- o "Stewardship Award" by Presbyterian Superintendents Association;
- o "Community Service Award" by Philadelphia O.I.C.;
- o "Human Needs Award" by Philadelphia N.P.C.C.C.;
- o "Brotherhood Award" by National Conference of Christians and Jews;
- o "Man of the Year" by Jewish War Veterans
- o "National Youth Hall of Fame"
- o "1985 Man of the Year" by Sigma Gamma Omega Fraternity;
- o "Outstanding Services Award" by the Salvation Army; and,
- o "Youth Individual Achievement" by Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge.
- o "Jefferson Award" by American Institute for Public Service

Financial support has to date come from thousands of individuals world-wide, and from hundreds of clubs, organizations, schools, corporations, and foundations, including:

- o Philadelphia Savings Fund Society;
- o Philadelphia National Bank;
- o WYSP Radio;
- o Dolfinger-McMahon Foundation;
- o Knollbrook Trust/The Glenmede Trust Company;
- o Rotary Clubs;
- o Union Benevolent Association;
- o Beatty Trust;
- o Southland Corporation (7-11 Stores);
- o William Penn Corporation;
- o Prudential Insurance Company;
- o Continental Bank; and,
- o United Way Donor Option.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Trevor's Campaign
A PROGRAM OF PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT

What started as a small gesture of giving by one young boy has now become an opportunity to help many. Trevor's simple act of kindness to a homeless, hungry, friendless person living on the streets of Philadelphia has evolved into a larger dream; a dream of sharing and giving, of recognition and celebration. Trevor has received a great deal of publicity for his simple act of caring. This Campaign wants others around the country to have this same opportunity for sharing, acknowledgement, support, and love.



2/86

Trevor's Campaign For the Homeless

120 W. LANCASTER AVENUE • ARDMORE, PA. 19003 • (215) 649-6400

SUGGESTIONS FOR HELPING
THE HOMELESS

We have had many requests for ways in which individuals or groups can help the homeless. There is no one answer to this question. Each person or group that writes to us has different capabilities as well as limitations, be they of time, availability, physical, financial or otherwise. Therefore, we are submitting a list of some ways to join TREVOR'S CAMPAIGN to care for the homeless with the hope that those of you who have written us for information will find in this list your own "place" in this vital effort to help those less fortunate than ourselves.

1. PRAY for the homeless and those striving to help them.

2. RESEARCH what is being done in your own area (via city/state/community efforts). Look into various organizations such as The Salvation Army, Red Cross, Jewish Charities, Catholic Charities, other religious institutions who may have shelters or hospices for the homeless or soup kitchens.

3. FOOD: See which shelter need food and arrange to make casseroles or ask others to make casseroles, sandwiches, provide drinks (coffee and juice our most popular requests) coffee cakes or donuts. Ask Senior Citizens Groups to make cookies. Ask churches or schools to collect canned goods and distribute them to the needy.

4. CLOTHING: Collect clothing - warm coats, woolen hats and carfs, socks, shoes, boots, sweaters, gloves. Take these things to the street people yourselves (always go in groups, never singly) or donate them to the organizations which serve the homeless.

5. PURCHASE OR COLLECT HOUSEHOLD ITEMS: Sheets, toothpaste and toothbrushes, soap, wash cloths, shampoo (luxury). Ask for BLANKETS, SLEEPING BAGS and PILLOWS - these are <u>essentials</u> for the homeless living on grates. Distribute these items.

6. KNOW: be familiar with the reasons why people live on the streets, foster respect for them despite their condition - stress LIFE ITSELF as the highest value and never fall prey to the "quality of life ethic" which stresses what a person DOES rather than <u>who a person is</u>. Be able to stand up for true values and defend the rejected members of our society from the "throw away mentality" which would elevate material advantages over HUMAN BEINGS. (One newspaper in Florida lamented the loss of the orange crops due to the freezing weather. This was the headline. In the same paper, at the bottom of a much later page, there was mention that 8 people froze to death on the streets in the same

COPY AVAILABLE

freeze....this was an item of much lesser importance to the editors).

7. DEVELOPE A ROUTE: We began delivering food in a station wagon. Then we were given a VAN. We developed a route through center city to feed the homeless. We went every night and still do. The street people are now familiar with our route....they wait for us...and we know them by name...they are "members of our family".

8. VOCALIZE: Write to your local newspapers, to major newspapers. Whenever you see an article or a letter referring to the homeless, respond to that information with information of your own regarding the situation. This keeps the story of the homeless in the press and if editors see an interest on the part of the public they will address the issue more frequently. It is YOUR CHANCE TO SAY..."I CARE...." since that is what you do when you take time to write.

9. LEGISLATURE: Write letters to the President, Congress, your elected officials. Tell them you want something done to help the homeless. Tell them you want more RESEARCH into mental illness so that the large percentage of deinstitutionalized mental patients who have ended up in our city streets unable to help themselves may one day be cured. Without research this will not happen...polio was cured because people CARED. The private sector, the medical community, people of every faith and position rolled up their sleeves and MARCHED...perhaps in our own day mental illness (a MAJOR cause of homelessness) can be cured to.. let's put pressure on our government to reclaim those patients, so callously evicted from the state hospitals, who really NEED medical care; for those who do not belong in hospitals or who will not return there for many good reasons let us press for more housing, more single room occupancy hotels with low rent, more halfway housing, more community outreach, better community mental health centers, more support to the families of the mentally ill who try to care for their loved ones in their own homes with no support or financial assistance when it is needed to keep the ill person living at home. Write not only for help for the mentally ill on our streets, but for the unemployed, the abused and battered who have fled there, the down and out persons who have suffered major losses and tragedies in their personal lives and could not cope with an overwhelming situation, for the people addicted to drugs or alcohol (these are real diseases too...not just "moral dereliction"). Write and pray for LL THE DESTITUTE.

10. JOIN: Individuals and groups who are helping the homeless be it through food distribution in the streets or caring for them in shelters or hospices. If you cannot join these groups personally perhaps you could donate to one of them financially...or you could donate an hour, a casserole, a blanket, a sleeping bag, a personal item, a "food treat"... whatever you CAN DO, DO.

11. PLAN: Perhaprs you can get involved on only a one-time basis... at Christmas, or on a special holiday. Plan for that event...tell yourself "this year at Christmas I will...." Not all of us can be involved on a regular basis but each of us can do SOMETHING. We have made a few suggestions and perhaps you will come up with many of your own ideas... ideas which fit YOU and YOUR program in a specific, individual way. Whatever you do, always know that you are forging your link in the chain of CARING which seems to be growing stronger every day in this land of ours...we are trying to reclaim our very own people...our Americans and ALL those who live in America...once more giving them the shelter and caring we once promised to all those who live in this noble land.

THANK YOU FOR CARING!

Trevor's Campaign For the Homeless

120 W. LANCASTER AVENUE • ARDMORE, PA. 19003 • (215) 649-6400

BACKGROUND ON TREVOR'S CAMPAIGN

YESTERDAY: December 8, 1983, eleven year old Trevor Ferrell saw a special report on the plight of the homeless. He was shocked to learn that people only 15 miles from his middle class suburban home in Gladwyne were living under such horrible circumstances. His immediate reaction was to help, and he convinced his parents to take him to center city that night. He gave his extra blanket and pillow to the first "street person" he saw. This eleven year old child's eyes saw people in need and he showed them he cared.

TODAY: Since December 8, Trevor, his family and a corp of dedicated volunteers have been delivering hot food nightly to Philadelphia's homeless men, women and children. They also provide blankets, clothing and sleeping bags. In addition, there is TREVOR'S PLACE, a 200 year old boarding house currently being renovated. It provides a permanent home for 20 homeless and when completed, the 33 bedroom facility, will be home for 100 people who now live on the streets.

Today, over two years later, Trevor is 13! And as Frank, (Trevor's Dad) would say, "nobody needs to push Trevor, he keeps pulling us along." Trevor is in demand, literally, all over the world, yet his main desire, still, is to be out on the street with his friends!

TOMORROW: There are plans for an additional shelter for women and children only, a second food delivery route, along with a comprehensive medical and dental care program and recreational activities. Chapters of the Campaign are opening up all across the country as people become more aware and concerned about the plight of the homeless.

59-645 O - 86 - 10

BEST AVAILABLE

1817 BOOKS & AUTHORS Harper & Row San Francisco

*For Immediate Release*

*Contact:* Margaret Flaharty (415) 989-9000

TREVOR OFFERS THE HOMELESS A LITTLE HELP FROM A FRIEND

On a winter night just before Christmas 1983, 11-year-old Trevor Ferrell, snug in the warmth of his Philadelphia home, watched the TV news report that would catapult him into national prominence and change forever his family's comfortable suburban existence.

The report, focusing on the plight of the homeless, was not exceptional --reports just like it are regularly viewed and promptly forgotten by millions of Americans. What was remarkable was the response of young Trevor, a boy of frequent but always passing enthusiasms who was floundering on the academic seas of sixth grade. Just an ordinary boy by all accounts.

TREVOR'S PLACE: THE STORY OF THE BOY WHO BRINGS HOPE TO THE HOMELESS (Harper & Row, Publishers: $12.95) is the story of that seemingly ordinary boy and the remarkable gift he shares with homeless and forgotten men and women. It is the story of how the passion of one small boy changed the lives of not only the poor, but the rich and powerful.

When Trevor demanded on that cold December night that his father Frank drive him into downtown Philadelphia so he could see for himself if "people really did live that way," no one could have anticipated that within weeks the Ferrell family and their neighbors would be spending each evening driving through the inner city handing out hot soup, peanut butter sandwiches, blankets, and clothing.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The news media soon dubbed their unorthodox efforts "Trevor's Campaign" and because of one young boy's commitment, there began to grow an unlikely bridge between the prosperous citizens of the Main Line Philadelphia suburbs and the unwashed wanderers living in alleys and abandoned buildings.

TREVOR'S PLACE brings the reader into the alien and often frightening world of Carl, the self-proclaimed Prince of the Streets; June, a sweet and gentle sixty year old who loves to dress up and calls the many voices she hears in her head by name; Mitch, a victim of cerebral palsy, who too often finds it impossible to defend himself against young street toughs; and Chico, who Trevor first encountered atop a steam grate and now is an "adopted" member of the Ferrell family.

TREVOR'S PLACE is also the story of the Ferrells (parents and children) and how their commitment to "Trevor's Campaign" strained a marriage and family beyond ordinary limits and saw Frank Ferrell closing a prosperous business to risk his own family's future to help the homeless.

Today, just two short years from that first latenight ride through Center City, "Trevor's Campaign" has grown to encompass hundreds of volunteers who regularly walk the alleys of Philadelphia handing out food and clothing. And there is now Trevor's Place, a 33-room hotel being renovated as a home for the once homeless.

Trevor, who is now 13 years old, has been recognized and honored by groups ranging from the Welsh Valley Middle School to the White House. He

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

recently realized a special dream of his own by spending part of his summer vacation working in Mother Teresa's home for the destitute in Calcutta, India.

When asked what difference one young boy can make to the overwhelming problem of the homeless, he replies with what has become his motto -- "I am only one, but I am one; I can't do everything, but I can do something."

♦ ♦ ♦

FRANK AND JANET FERRELL live with their four children, Allen, Liza, Trevor, and Jody in Gladwyne, Pennsylvania, where they work fulltime with "Trevor's Campaign".

EDWARD WAKIN, Ph.D. is nationally known for his hundreds of magazine articles and over 20 books on religous and social issues. A former newspaperman, he is a past winner of the George Polk Award for "Distinguished Achievement in Journalism". Wakin is currently a professor in Fordham University's communications department.

TREVOR'S PLACE: THE BOY WHO BRINGS HOPE TO THE HOMELESS
by Frank and Janet Ferrell with Edward Wakin
Publication date: September 18, 1985
Price: $12.95
Length: 160 pages
ISBN: 0-06-062531-7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

120 W. LANCASTER AVENUE • ARDMORE, PA. 19003 • (215) 649-6400

MISSION STATEMENT

On behalf of Trevor Ferrell, his family, and those of us who work for Trevor's Campaign, thank you for your interest. It is our goal to help other individuals and groups form chapters of Trevor's Campaign for the Homeless in their local communities, wherever there is an indentified need and people are willing to respond and commit themselves.

It is very important for you to realize, however, that this kind of committment is one that is really 365 days a week. Your goal should be to have enough people involved who will share in the total committment that is necessary to successfully meet the need of this population.

The following is the MISSION STATEMENT of Trevor's Campaign for the Homeless:

* To develop one boy's vision by responding to both the spiritual and physcial need of the homeless in ways which demonstrate unconditional love and caring.

* To provide food, clothing, counsel, and shelter to the homeless and hungry according to needs; recoguizing that some homeless persons need temporary shelter while others, especially the chronically mentally ill, require permanent shelter.

* To provide guidance for educations and assistance to the unemployed among the homeless that they may develop the skills needed to become self-sustaining.

* To stimulate public awareness, sensitivity, and response, around the world, to the plight of the homeless.

The questions most often asked are:

1. Where do we find volunteers?

* Volunteers can be found through your neighbors, local church groups, and public service announcements and advertisements in local newspapers.

2. Where can we get food?

* Many of the volunteers you will be working with will be willing to cook food on a scheduled basis. Some will want to cook daily, weekly, or monthly. Someone is needed to coordinate this activity. You may also find it advantageous to contact local hamburger chains and other fast food distributors, as well as local supermarket stores and chains.

AVAILABLE

3. How do we provide shelter?

* This will probably be the most difficult task since the donation of a building is an expensive one. Check with the housing authority to see if there are homes that you may lease for as little as one dollar per year on the commitment that you will renovate it. Again, utilize your contacts. There just may be someone who has a property they may be willing to give to you in order to receive the tax benefits. You won't know unless you ask. You may discover the need to set up two seperate shelters - one for women and children and one for men.

4. How do we get clothing for the homeless?

* Clothing drives from your school and church groups are quite easy to organize. Trevor started by approaching neighbors to clean out their closets and attics. He then proceeded to put homemade posters in merchants' windows.

5. How do we become affiliated with Trevor's Campaign for the Homeless?

* We have attached a brief questionaire. This will provide us with the information we need in order for us to properly evaluate your need and begin the process of helping you set up a new chapter.

There are so many questions and no real answers for all of them. It is our desire to work closely with you from the beginning so that your new chapter can become an efficient, viable force in this effort to care, lovingly, for the needs of others.

COPY AVAILABLE

## Prepared Statement of Mary Curran, Director, Community of Hope Family Shelter, Washington, DC

The homeless population of the U.S. is an essentially neglected one. Despite intermittent federal intervention the problem has remained one which has been largely relegated to local communities and non-profit organizations. Furthermore, homelessness has been equated with transiency, and non-residence, therefore, local communities have been unwilling to invest professional and economic resources into individuals who are not considered to be 'their responsibility.'

However, recent studies related to the homeless 'urban' population indicate three new trends which must be considered in planning and serving the homeless. These are:

1.) Homeless persons found in the inner-city today are not transient but have resided in a rather small geographical area for three years or longer.

2.) The number of women present in this population has increased dramatically with as many as 600 women being observably homeless in the District of Columbia alone. The most recent phenomenon among the female homeless population is the number of 18 to 22 year olds who spent 4 years or more in foster care during their teenage years leaving them with no support system to make the transition from adolescence to young adulthood.

3.) The number of family units living without permanent shelter has become an increasing problem particularly in urban areas where affordable housing is limited.

Basic survival, that is, the availability of food, shelter, and warm clothing, becomes a daily concern for the homeless, and in actual fact, simply providing for the 'basics' constitutes the daily routine of not only the homeless themselves but their advocates, particularly those representing community or non-profit organizations. Of specific concern to me and the agency I represent are the following issues:

1.) First, the need to respond to the nutritional and medical concerns of homeless single individuals with relationship to both food and consistent medical care is very pressing. Community and non-profit organizations need in-kind resources in order to provide for those cases where more than a maintenance diet and/or stable environment are required. For instance, statistics indicate that 26% of all Black women are hypertensive, in addition, another 16% are borderline hypertensive. Non-profit shelters cannot absorb the cost of providing a special diet and the medical care necessary to control hypertension in this population. They can however, provide shelter, nutritional and medical counseling, refrigeration for food, and use of cooking facilities. In addition, many shelters can provide transportation to and from medical and social service appointments.

Most non-profit shelters only provide one full meal per day. Every effort is made to make this meal nutritious but often it is at best filling (with a high content of starch and sugar). Individuals with hypertension and/or diabetes cannot maintain and certainly cannot improve their health on this type of diet.

Persons in the helping professions are asking you to consider re-evaluating the eligibility requirements for food stamp recipients recognizing that many single individuals would benefit tremendously through food stamp supplments. It should be noted that there is a professional support system within community and non-profit shelters to help individuals use their stamps wisely.

Secondly, even in shelters where three meals are provided each day there are often special dietary needs which require extra juice, milk, or staple foods. A particularly frequent instance of this is diarrhea among infants and toddlers in city family shelters. Since loss of fluids (dehydration) is a common symptom among those having diarrhea there is a specific concern that infants who have such little body weight, therefore, limited retention of fluids have access to extra fluids and pedialyte (a nutrient filled liquid) when they have diarrhea. Often, only money available from FEMA which has been used to purchase local grocery certificates allows us to procure needed liquids or food for medical emergencies.

Thirdly, we would like to request that consideration be given to homeless families in transition from one shelter program to a second or third stage shelter program. The purpose of moving from one program to another is to help the client become more and more self-sufficient, this is difficult when with each step forward the client takes two steps backwards and often is terminated from all benefits because of a change in address. This means that when a client enters a second stage shelter where he or she is supposed to be concentrating on career development weeks are again spent in either reapplying for benefits or going out day after day in search of food and other assistance to provide for the family's basic needs. It needs to be understood that in second and third stage shelter the client lives in their own apartment and is responsible for the total care of their family. The system continually works against itself spending endless tax dollars and man hours re-certifying families for benefits which have already been clearly identified as recipients with families who are known to be participating in a long term rehabilitation program. In case after case delays of weeks in reinstating food and medical benefits along with AFDC can be directly attached to the inability and/or unwillingness of workers to follow through on cases. Workers are also unfamiliar with the community and non-profit agencies which exist in the area and refuse benefits on the basis that a family is in a 'shelter' even after we have sent written verification that the family is in a second stage program which requires them to pay rent, cook food etc. In this instance we are again dependent upon FEMA money to provide food for a family expected to provide their own food but waiting for food stamps to arrive. In addition I would like to suggest that it would be cost efficient as well as a motivating factor for clients (who often come to us enthusiastic about the opportunity to begin school or work and then have to delay [illegible] due to having to work on benefits) to assign one intake-caseworker to each shelter site. If client load demands two workers could be assigned, but these workers would understand the progression of the local shelter system and could certify clients quickly and efficiently so that families could adjust and begin the process of moving towards independence.

In general, I feel that more co-operation and respect needs to exist between government agencies and community and non-profit groups. Local organizations are designed to provide supportive not comprehensive services and often are able to provide the personal contact with and support for clients which may serve as an impetus for future financial independence. However, we cannot do what we do best, which is to utilize both private and public funds in a cost efficient manner without the support of local and federal government.

## Prepared Statement of Hon. Joseph P. Addabbo, a Representative in Congress From the State of New York

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, it gives me great pleasure to present this testimony to you today on behalf of the homeless. I believe that my legislation, H.R. 770, would go a long way in easing the plight of these unfortunates and I applaud your willingness to grabble with this issue.

As you may know, my home City of New York has one of the largest homeless populations in the United States. Our state and local people are also among the most experienced in the Nation in dealing with the problems of the homeless. We are at the forefront of innovation in this area and have already implemented many creative, yet practical plans for sheltering and feeding our homeless population, and for helping them on the road to a better life. We have gone far, but we can go further. With your help, we will.

My bill, the Homeless Assistance Act, is very simple in concept. It will allow persons who have no fixed address to use their food stamps to buy prepared meals in public non-profit establishments that are approved to provide this service. It will allow food stamps to be used in certain private establishments that contract with a state to offer meals at reduced prices. This idea is somewhat similar to the provision in current law which allows the aged to purchase group or delivered meals with their food stamps. Those using stamps for this purpose must be otherwise eligible for food stamps under federal law, so we are not advocating an increase in cost for food stamp allowance.

I feel this is an essential and humanitarian move since most homeless do not have access to traditional kitchen facilities. At this point I think a little background is in order.

In June, 1984, our New York State Department of Social Services submitted a proposal to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to allow

In June, 1984, our New York State Department of Social Services submitted a proposal to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to allow a demonstration project which would permit approximately 500 homeless families in New York City who are currently temporarily housed in two hotels or motels to use food stamps to purchase prepared food at an on-premise restaurant or at an on-premise communal dining service. The purpose of the project is to demonstrate that the nutritional value of the meals that homeless families eat will improve if they are permitted to get the best value for their food stamp dollars. For nearly two years our State has been trying to negotiate with Agriculture so that this project can move ahead. To date there have been two rejections and we are no closer to a resolution than we were in 1984. Meanwhile, we have homeless people who are not able to use their food stamps effectively, or are not able to use them at all.

Now, I have seen correspondence between USDA and our people, and I understand there are some technical difficulties to be ironed-out. The primary reason the proposal has not been accepted is that USDA feels the plans do not adequately address the nutritional needs of the homeless. They stress the Thrifty Food Plan upon which the food stamp allotment is based and that they feel the allowance would not be sufficient to cover costs.

I do not want to get into technical nitty gritty here, but I ask you to remember we are talking about people who have no kitchens, no place to go to cook a decent meal; in some cases there is not even a nearby supermarket. We are not talking about your typical family, we are talking about a homeless population. The

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

choice is not between the Thrifty Food Plan and some other plan, but between eating and not eating, and between eating a decent hot meal and any junk cold food handy.

If I seem mad, it's because I am. Not because USDA has not approved my state's project, but because I feel that Agriculture is not exercising the sensitivity needed in these circumstances or showing the flexibility necessary to deal effectively with the problems facing homeless people.

This is why I have introduced this legislation and why I urge you to do everything possible to move it along. Our local people are doing their best to help the homeless. We have had to resort to sheltering them in non-traditional ways, and now we need to be able to feed them in non-traditional ways. The food stamp law must be flexible enough, without sacrificing the integrity of the program, to allow for these novel solutions to the difficult problem of feeding people who cannot cook for themselves or have no home in which to set a decent table.

This Committee is well known for its openmindedness and its creative approach to dealing with hunger. Your leadership is essential in this case, and I hope I can count on your support.

Thank you.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Prepared Statement of Jo-Ann Eccher, M.P.H., Director, Project Bread Hunger Hotline, Boston, MA

As a public health nutritionist and Director of the Project Bread Hunger Hotline, I thank you for the opportunity to address the House Select Committee on Hunger regarding food stamps and the homeless. The Project Bread Hunger Hotline, an information, referral and advocacy center on food and hunger issues in Eastern Massachusetts, works with over 300 emergency food providers, serving as a central location for anti-hunger advocacy especially around the food stamp program.

The Food Security Act of 1985 had the intent to expand eligibility of the food stamp program for homeless persons through clarifying that those who do not live at a fixed address or in a permanent dwelling are eligible for the program. At the Hunger Hotline we prescreen homeless persons for food stamp eligiblity at soup kitchens and simply instruct the homeless individual that if s/he spends alot of time in one area, that they should apply for food stamps at the welfare office covering that area.

It would seem that homeless persons have access to the food stamp program. However a homeless person is only eligible for the food stamp program if s/he decides to live in a car, a condemned building or on the streets. Homeless people who spend the night in shelters serving meals are routinely

denied the food stamp benefits to which they are entitled. It is to this issue that I would like to limit my statements to today.

In the original Food Stamp Act of 1964 residents of institutions,that serve a majority of the resident's meals, are ineligible to participate in the food stamp program, (7 C.F.R. 273.1 e). The interpetation of this code of federal regulations has been translated by regional USDA offices, and local food stamp offices to mean that the homeless person who sleeps in a shelter for the homeless and receives food at the shelter can not participate in the food stamp program. This interpetation is misconceived for the following reasons:

1. A shelter guest has no reasonable certainty that he or she will be a resident of the homeless shelter for any period of time. It is my reading of the regulations that shelter guest who must leave the shelter each morning and check in from day to day or week to week should not be disqualified from the Food Stamp Program. The concept of "reasonable certainty" is not foreign to the Food Stamp Program in that the program only counts income which both the household and worker are reasonably certain will be received during a certification period. In the City of Boston were there exist 1611 shelter beds and estimates of 9800 homeless it is quite clear that obtaining a shelter bed on a night to night basis is not an easy feat.

2. Even though many shelters may serve a "majority of the meals" as a Masters trained public health nutritionist I know that a "majority of the meals" does not equal a majority of the the nutritional needs of the homeless individual. Having contacted a number of shelters in the Boston area to inquire about the frequency and content of the meals served, Hunger Hotline nutritionists report that although most shelters provide a maximum of two meals per day, that the breakfast or luncheo served often consist of a roll and coffee. The nutritionist

to not, consider the breakfasts or lunches served as "meals" but rather as"snacks" which would otherwise be similar to the daytime snacks served to children as defined by the USDA Child Care Feeding Program. Further, the nutritionist found out that many of the shelter guest do not in fact eat all of the meals served by the shelter due, in part, to shelter policies limiting the times of day meals are served and requirements in many shelters that guest leave early in the morning and return at night. Specifically the survey of 6 Boston shelters indicated that the shelter meals were lacking in milk and milk products, fruit juices, fruit, and salads. These meals,using the nutrition assessment tool of evaluating population diets with food frequencies,lack vitamins C, D, riboflavin, thiamin, and other B vitamins along with minerals such as calcium, potassium and phosphorous. While shelter meals will prevent starvation they will not prevent disease or promote health. Shelters , given their limited resources, both financial, volunteers and access to nutritional technical assistance, have a difficult time providing consistent and nutritious diets to their guest. In addition shelters are unable to adequately accommodate special diets (low sodium, diabetic) and this further limits the homeless individual's ability to consume a majority of his/her meals at a shelter.

I believe that the original intent of 7 CFR 273.1 (e) was to disqualify primarily those insititutionalized individuals who are somewhat restricted in their ability to enter and exit the institution, ( e.g. a discharge procedure is necessary), and whose basic needs, (food and shelter), are essentially guaranteed over an extended period of time. Residents of nursing homes, public residental schools and mental health institutions fall most readily into this category ; not shelters for the homeless. Exceptions have been added to 7 CFR 273.1 (e). These include (1) elderly persons or SSI beneficiaries and thier spouses eating in special locations that include senior citizen centers, and federally subsidized housing for the elderly, (2) narcotic addicts or alcoholics obtaining meals in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

drug addiction or alcohol treatment centers (3) disabled or blind recipients of social security disability payments of SSI residing in non-profit group living arrangements, and (4) women and children residing in shelters for battered women that serve meals to shelter residents. Note: women and children in crisis due to homelessness and residing in family shelters are denied food stamps!

It is evident that the language of 7 CRF 273.1 (e) is very weak and open to a wide range of interpetation. The interpetation of a shelter for the homeless as an institution is left open to USDA. The local welfare office/ food stamp office not seeing homeless shelters as an exemption from the definition of "institution" therefore continues to deny the homeless residing in a shelter which serves 2 meals the right to participate in the food stamp program, (even if residency is just for a few nights that a bed is available). I urge your committee to review this language of 7 CRF 273.1 (e) and to work towards its clarification so that homeless individuals and families may improve their nutritional status, fill in the nutritional gaps left by shelter meals and have access to the food stamp programto which they are entitled. I ask you to support measures to open up the food stamp program to the homeless and truly expand the eligiblity of the food stamp program for a nutritionally vulnerable group - the homeless.

Another way to expand the homeless' usage of the food stamp program is to permit food stamp recipients with no fixed address to purchase meals in approved restaurants with food stamps. 7 CFR 271.2 does allow private establishments to contract with State or local agencies to offer meals at concessional prices to elderly persons or SSI recipients, and their spouses. This should be expanded to include the homeless as well. In 1985 Representative Addabbo (D-N.Y.) introduced H.R. 770, "The Homeless Protection Act" to permit homeless food stamp recipients to purchase meals in restuarants with food stamps. I urge you to pursue this in order that homeless households have greater access to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nutritious foods.

In closing I would like to address how the homeless would be able to use food stamps while awaiting legislation to allow their usage in sanctioned restuarants. Although the Food Stamp Act prohibits the purchasing of prepared foods, pizza, deli-food, etc, which the homeless individual would benefit from since the homeless individual lacks cooking and storage facilities; the homeless food stamp recipient would still have a wide array of nutritious foods in the marketplace to choose. The homeless person could choose peanut butter, bread, cheese, tuna, juice, high energy snacks etc. The lack of cooking and storage facilites although complicating the food selection process still allows for a variety of food choices. USDA's own studies have shown that low income individuals/households purchase more nutrients per dollar spent on food than any other income group.

I thank you for this opportunity to address you and urge you to work towards clarification of 7 CRF 273.1 (e) to allow homeless individuals/households residing in shelters serving meals to be eligible for the food stamp program and to work towards expanding the homeless individual/household's usage of their food stamp coupon by allowing food stamps to be used in restaurants.

[From The New York Times, Feb. 19, 1986]

# HOMELESS ARE NOT THE DUTY OF U.S., REAGAN AIDE SAYS

By JONATHAN FUERBRINGER
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 18 — The director of the Office of Management and Budget said today that the homeless of America were a problem for state and local governments, not for the Federal government.

In testimony before the House Budget Committee, James C. Miller 3d, the budget director, added that "there are a number of grants we have" to help local governments with programs for the homeless. But when he named one, the Community Services Block Grant, he was told by a Democratic member of the committee that the Reagan Administration had proposed eliminating this grant in its budget for the fiscal year 1987, which was prepared under Mr. Miller's supervision.

Before now, statements by President Reagan and his aides, have fueled criticism of the Administration attitude toward the homeless. The Department of Housing and Urban Development estimated in May 1984 that 250,000 to 350,000 people were homeless in America, a figure critics said was low.

## Impasse on 1986 Cuts

Earlier today, Senate Republican leaders said that they did not expect Congress to pass to approve major portions of the 1986 deficit-reducing package that remained unpassed at the end of the last session of Congress. Both Democrats and Republicans had hoped they could begin this year by approving parts of the package. But the House and the Senate, cannot agree on a compromise that would also be acceptable to the White House, according to two key Senators, Pete V. Domenici, Republican of New Mexico, and Bob Packwood, Republican of Oregon.

It now appears that budget writers, instead, will use some of the savings proposals intended to cut the 1986 deficit as a starting point for a compromise on reduction of the 1987 deficit to the $144 billion ceiling set by the new budget-balancing law.

In other developments, Republicans and Democrats on the Senate Budget Committee said they were worried that a new Congressional Budget Office projection that shows the budget deficits declining from 1986 through 1991 even without further Congessional action, may undermine the deficit-cutting effort this year.

The main reasons for the declining path are lower projections for military spending and the estimation that interest payments on the national debt will be lower than projected, because the budget office now assumes the deficit will be eliminated by 1991, as required under the new law, an assumption not included in previous estimates.

Rudolph G. Penner, the budget office director, released the projections today.

Senate Budget Committee members, including Mr. Domenici, the chairman, also were concerned that the Congressional office's projection, that the deficit must be reduced $37 billion in the 1987 fiscal year to reach the $144 billion ceiling, might make the task look too easy.

The Administration's estimate is $38 billion. Just weeks ago estimates from the Congressional office and the Administration predicted that more than $50 billion in savings would be needed.

In the House Budget Committee's hearing, Mr. Miller's comments on the homeless were prompted by questions from Representative Mike Lowry, Democrat of Washington. Mr. Lowry started by asking if the homeless were a problem in the United States.

Mr. Miller said 'yes,' then added, 'It is a very bad thing; it tugs on one's heart strings."

But he added, "We believe the homeless are not a Federal responsibility but a state and local responsibility."

When he said the Government had grants to help states, Mr. Lowry asked which ones. After some prompting by Mr. Lowry, Mr. Miller named the Community Services Block Grants. Then Mr. Lowry pointed out that the Administration's budget proposes eliminating the grants in 1987 for a savings of $306 million. Mr. Miller had no answer to this but said he would talk to his staff about the details.

Mr. Lowry, after the hearing, said that the Administration in its 1987 budget proposed eliminating $70 million for the homeless that was in the 1986 budget of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. He also said the Administration had proposed cuts in the community grant program, which local governments could use to assist the homeless.

In December 1983, Edwin Meese 3d, then counsellor to the President and now Attorney General, spurred a controversy over the issue of the homeless, when he said, "I think some people are going to soup kitchens voluntarily. I know we've had considerable information that people go to soup kitchens because the food is free and that's easier than paying for it."

In January 1984, Mr. Reagan said that he thought some of the homeless people sleeping on grates in cities were doing so "by choice."

Material Submitted by Myron Winick, Professor of Nutrition, Columbia University

Excerpt From Health Care of Homeless People

# 7

# Nutritional and Vitamin Deficiency States

Myron Winick

Malnutrition, strictly speaking, is any deviation in the eating pattern of an individual that leads to an abnormal nutritional status. If calorie and protein intake is insufficient, the result is often referred to as protein-calorie malnutrition. This type of malnutrition will cause a series of changes within the body that, if not corrected, can lead to progressive deterioration and death. Fat tissue is completely consumed, muscle mass is markedly reduced, water is lost from the cells and accumulates between them and sometimes within the body's cavities, heart rate slows, blood pressure drops, temperature is subnormal, and the patient responds by doing whatever is necessary to conserve the body's energy. A person suffering from protein-calorie malnutrition shows apathy, slower movements, and decreased activity.

As one of its earliest manifestations, protein-calorie malnutrition will increase an individual's susceptibility to infection by reducing the competence of the immune system. Thus infection, which is very common in the homeless population, could be a complication of, or at least aggravated by, the individual's nutritional status. One important reason to keep the homeless individual's calorie intake as high as possible is to ward off certain kinds of infections rampant in that population.[1]



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## THE HOMELESS ON THEIR OWN: VITAMIN DEFICIENCIES

Perhaps much more important than low calorie intake in the homeless in this country is the problem of imbalances: the kinds of foods they eat and the nutrient content of those foods. Insufficient intake of certain vitamins and minerals may lead to specific deficiencies and symptoms caused by those deficiencies. B-vitamin deficiencies can affect the central nervous system; vitamin C deficiency can result in poor wound healing; folic acid, vitamin $B_{12}$, and iron deficiency can result in anemia; zinc deficiency may cause abnormalities in taste, which in turn may further compromise nutritional status; and calcium deficiency will accelerate the process of osteoporosis, the formation of brittle bones. Many of these deficiencies can be induced by alcoholism.

Most important in the alcoholic are deficiencies of the water soluble vitamins and of certain minerals. We are most concerned about thiamine, vitamin $B_6$, and folic acid because alcohol interferes with the absorption of all three of these vitamins.[2]

Thiamine deficiency, or beri-beri, is, in the United States, extremely rare in the general population, but it is not uncommon in an indigent alcoholic population. Beri-beri can take two forms. One affects the cardiovascular system and culminates in heart failure. Every resident working in an emergency room must be aware that one cause of high output heart failure in an alcoholic patient is thiamine deficiency. One can cure what we call high output beri-beri by simply giving a shot of thiamine. A second form of beri-beri affects the nervous system: the muscles to the hands and feet weaken and the classical picture of wrist and foot drop results. The homeless, who may have poor nutrition and a high incidence of alcoholism to begin with, are also at risk of thiamine deficiency and the heart failure and neurologic disease that accompany it.

Symptoms of vitamin $B_6$ deficiency are more insidious and difficult to diagnose. Major deficiencies in vitamin $B_6$ lead to depression, which is quite common in the homeless populations. The extent to which this depression may be aggravated or induced by a vitamin $B_6$ deficiency is unknown at the present time.

Folic acid deficiency is the most common vitamin deficiency in the United States. Anybody may be initially presumed as deficient in folic acid. Alcoholics are known to have severe problems with folic acid absorption. Therefore, one would generally predict folic acid deficiency in the homeless.

AVAILABLE

Folic acid is essential for all cellular division. Thus a deficiency of this vitamin will lead to a slower rate of cell division in those organs where cells are rapidly dividing. The bone marrow, where new blood cells are rapidly being made, is most vulnerable to folic acid deficiency, which leads mainly to a macrocytic type of anemia. It is possible that much of the anemia found in this country's poor is more often due to folic acid deficiency than we tend to believe.

The mineral that we are most concerned about in the poor is zinc, which is also essential for cell division and, therefore, to pregnant women and to children through adolescence. Zinc deficiency can have devastating consequences, including birth defects and poor growth and sexual development. While zinc deficiency in adults is difficult to pinpoint, it leads to two manifestations, each of which could have serious practical considerations. The first are skin rashes, which are common in the homeless person. Second, zinc deficiency leads to abnormalities in taste. Taste is blunted in patients with low levels of zinc in their bodies, and that, too, is a potential problem in the homeless.

Another problem with the homeless is that they are often on drugs (either psychotropic drugs, street drugs, or medications for particular illness), which interact with the diet and can cause certain specific deficiencies. Diuretic drugs may deplete the body's potassium reserves; antiacids may cause an imbalance in the amount of aluminum or magnesium absorbed; aspirin may result in microscopic gastrointestinal bleeding and hence anemia; and many of the so-called tranquilizer drugs can affect appetite.

The classic example is the use of isoniazide for the treatment of tuberculosis. Isoniazide specifically interferes with the metabolism of vitamin $B_6$, and all patients who are being treated with that drug must be given supplements of vitamin $B_6$. Dilantin is used in the treatment of epilepsy, yet dilantin interferes with the metabolism of folic acid. Any patient who is being treated with dilantin should be on folic acid supplements. So we see the problems compounded: the same nutrients affected by alcoholism are also affected by certain drugs.[3]

## THE HOMELESS UNDER CARE: DIETARY PROBLEMS

Far more important than nutrient deficiencies are the relationships between chronic disease and the kinds of diets these individuals consume. The incidence of hypertension and coronary artery disease is signifi-

cant among the homeless. And yet if we examine not only what they eat when they are on their own, but what they eat when they are under so-called care, we see that numerous dietary problems persist. These diets are made up from a standard formula prepared by dietitians for institutional patients. Such diets ensure that each of the three meals contains at least one-third of the recommended daily allowance (RDA) for each of the nutrients. The problem is that there are no curbs on the excess of certain nutrients. Because of the epidemic nature of cardiovascular and certain other diseases in this country, Americans should reduce the amount of saturated fat and cholesterol and increase the amount of complex carbohydrate in their diet. In addition, they should reduce the amount of salt or sodium in their diet.[4]

Let us examine a monthly menu schedule. The menu used by the City of New York for its shelter programs provides at least one-third of the daily requirements for all of the known nutrients. However, the menu plan calls for eggs to be served four times a week. Eggs are a very good source of necessary vitamins and minerals, but they are also very high in cholesterol and saturated fat. Cheeses, a commodity that our benevolent government has been giving away, are frequently used. Cheese in general, and particularly hard cheese, is very high in salt (sodium). Lunch or luncheon-type meats such as bologna and hot dogs, which are used frequently, are very high in sodium. Pickled beets, sauerkraut, and sour pickles—again, items served frequently—are also high in sodium.

Not only could such a diet cause problems in people already suffering from hypertension; it could induce hypertension in a population already at high risk. Clearly, we should try to limit the amount of salt and fat in the diet of the homeless population, but there are few attempts to do so. I must commend the imagination of the people in charge of the shelter I visited: much of the snack food they serve comes from AMTRAK, which donates snack food that has not been sold on trains at the end of each day. But while this is an imaginative way of getting food, I wonder how many salty potato chips come from this source.

Another problem, at least in the shelter I visited, was pregnancy. A number of young women were pregnant and homeless. Such a situation imposes major nutritional demands. Weight gain during pregnancy has to be carefully monitored. A pregnant woman, particularly one who comes from a homeless background, should be given supplements or multivitamin and multimineral preparations. She should also be eating foods rich in calcium and iron. This is very difficult, since they are among the most expensive foods on the market. Any woman who

is pregnant and homeless is at high risk and probably ought to be hospitalized for a major part of her pregnancy.

The last group at high risk, particularly if homeless, is the elderly, who have specific nutritional needs and requirements. But again, the diets we are giving these people do not reflect those particular needs. One of the major problems in older individuals is osteoporosis.

Osteoporosis is a serious disease. It is the twelfth leading cause of death in the United States and results most commonly in fractures of the vertebrae or hip. Osteoporosis is ten times as frequent in women as in men and is probably the leading cause of serious debility in older women.

Women are more susceptible because they begin to lose calcium from their bones at a relatively rapid rate around age thirty; men do not do this until about age forty. In addition, women increase their calcium demands during pregnancy and lactation. And, finally, further profound changes occur at menopause that result in a dramatic increase in the rate of calcium loss from bones. Low calcium intake aggravates all of these processes. Although the effects of osteoporosis cannot be reversed with calcium, the progression can be slowed. The major source of calcium in the standard shelter diet is milk. But many people cannot tolerate large amounts of milk, due to an inability to digest lactose, or common milk sugar. Lactose intolerance is particularly prevalent in adult blacks and Orientals, as well as in some Caucasians with a Mediterranean background. These people lose most of the activity of the enzyme lactase, which was present in high amounts in childhood. As a consequence, lactose, a disaccharide (carbohydrate made of two sugar molecules), is not split into its compound parts, glucose and galactose. The undigested lactose passes into the lower portion of the gastrointestinal tract, where it is fermented into acids and gases by bacteria, causing diarrhea and gas pain. These symptoms are controlled by reducing the intake of milk and dairy products, thereby avoiding the consumption of lactose.

Thus milk, the food that is richest in calcium content and goes furthest toward providing one-third of the total daily required nutrients in each meal, cannot be consumed by that segment of the population that may need it the most. Substitute foods that are rich in calcium must be found.

The inevitable conclusion is that this population should be given supplementary vitamins and minerals. One must balance risks against benefits. But in balancing the diet and the potential for vitamin deficiency in the homeless against the risk of taking a vitamin preparation,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I believe that this population should receive supplements. This is not being done. Only certain vitamins are sporadically given, subject to availability. Any multivitamin and mineral preparation that provides the recommended daily allowance for each nutrient (not higher) is appropriate.

Thus the homeless population has specific nutritional problems and therefore specific nutritional needs. These are not being met under present conditions, even in the shelter facilities. Perhaps listing these needs, as I have tried to do, will stimulate some change in the way the homeless are fed.

## REFERENCES

1. Winick M. Hunger disease: studies by the Jewish physicians in the Warsaw ghetto. Current concepts in nutrition. Winick M, ed., Vol. 7. New York: John Wiley, 1979.
2. Winick M. Nutrition in health and disease. New York: John Wiley, 1980.
3. Winick M. Nutrition and drugs. Current concepts in nutrition, Winick M, ed., Vol. 12. New York: John Wiley, 1983.
4. Winick M. Nutrition and the killer diseases. Current concepts in nutrition, Winick M, ed., Vol. 10. New York: John Wiley, 1981.
5. Winick M. Nutrition disorders in American women. Current concepts in nutrition, Winick M, ed., Vol. 5. New York: John Wiley, 1977.

AVAILABLE

THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10007

March 12, 1986

Select Committee on Hunger
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Members of Congress:

I was very distressed by newspaper accounts of the testimony of young David Bright before the House Select Committee on Hunger on March 6, 1986. The testimony simply does not reflect reality. New York does more for the homeless than any other city in America, spending millions upon millions of dollars to fulfill my commitment to provide food and shelter to anybody in need.

We need the Federal government to renew its commitment to low-income housing if we are to see an end to the national crisis of homelessness. I urge Congress to appropriate the resources needed to truly help cities and states house the poor, and toward that end, I support any effort to focus Federal attention on the problems of the homeless. But it angers me to see advocates misuse a little boy to demean this City's tremendous efforts. I believe the attached letter from George Gross, Commissioner of New York's Human Resources Administration, sets the record straight.

Sincerely,

Edward I. Koch
MAYOR

The City of New York

HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION
250 CHURCH STREET NEW YORK, N.Y. 10013

GEORGE GROSS
Administrator Commissioner

March 11, 1986

Hon. Mickey Leland, Chair
Select Committee on Hunger
U.S. House of Representatives
H2-507 House Office Building Annex II
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Representative Leland:

I feel compelled to comment on the testimony given by young David Bright to the House Select Committee on Hunger on March 6, 1986.

I was very disturbed by David's statements, and I immediately checked into his situation. David currently lives at the Martinique Hotel, a shelter for homeless families in the heart of Manhattan in New York City. Our records show that his family is made up of his mother, four children from nine to 16 years old, and a nine-year-old cousin. The family has lived in shelters and hotels since May 20, 1984 and at the Martinique since February 23, 1985.

Under federal law, we are not permitted to reveal the particular benefits received by the Bright family. However, a homeless AFDC family, similar in size to the Bright family, receives substantial benefits and services. The family receives full payment for their shelter at the hotel. Every month, such a family receives an income maintenance payment of $465.20, food stamps in the amount of $185.00, a restaurant allowance of $384.00, and a transportation payment of $26.00. This is a monthly total of $1,060.00 over and above the shelter benefit. A typical family of this size also receives between approximately $2,000 and $6,000 in medicaid services annually, depending on whether any long-term hospitalization is required. In addition, the children receive free breakfast and lunch at school (or lunch at the hotel), and free transportation to and from school. The entire family also receives medical and social services available in the hotel.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

At the Martinique, services to HRA clients include:

- seven full-time on-site Crisis Intervention Services social workers;
- one Department of Health nurse three days a week;
- one Board of Education attendance officer;
- two Board of Education community workers;
- a supply of nutritious snacks--peanut butter, crackers, juice, cereals--nourishing food which doesn't need cooking;
- counseling groups for mothers and children;
- adolescent recreation and counseling programs; and
- day care for pre-school age children and after-school programs for elementary school children.

The annual cost of these services is approximately $750,000 which represents about $2,000 per family. Also, the community is renovating the hotel ballroom for recreational use.

I want to assure you that the case managers at the Martinique know David Bright well. They say he is intelligent and articulate. He has not complained of being hungry. There appear to be occasions, though, when David's school bus is late and he may miss breakfast. I have asked the school to consider such lateness and to be sure that all children from hotels receive breakfast every day.

We also provide assistance and transportation to families in hotels and shelters in locating permanent housing. We want Mrs. Bright and her family to have their own apartment as soon as possible. We will encourage her to use our van program in order to see available, renovated city-owned apartments.

Now, concerning security. The Martinique management provides four to five guards per shift, around the clock. However, certain very tough problems are built into the system as it now stands.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Martinique management had established a "no visitors" policy for the purpose of protecting HRA clients, but the Legal Aid Society brought suit--which they won--and now the Martinique is open to anyone at any time. Consequently, it is very difficult for the hotel staff to monitor the large number of visitors who come in and out all day and night. I must also note that although security is not perfect, we have no record nor do staff have recollection of any incident of rape as was reported in press accounts of David's appearance before your Committee.

New York City, as you know, has a severe housing shortage; no family, however, is denied shelter. Today we provide shelter for 4,157 families, or approximately 16,000 people. That's a 21 percent increase from this time last year, and nearly a 400 percent increase from 1981. Most families in need are placed in 56 commercial hotels throughout the five boroughs. We know sheltering children in hotels is not the ideal solution, but until sufficient permanent housing and long-term congregate facilities are developed, it is the only solution. There is no better alternative.

Given the current Administration's abandonment of the long standing federal commitment to housing for families of low and moderate income, it is difficult to envision an end to either the housing shortage in New York or the homelessness. We are doing all that we can with local resources. We have, for example, renovated more than 6,000 apartments for homeless families since August, 1983 and will produce hundreds more in 1986. We are committing, in addition, hundreds of millions in local dollars to housing programs in the years ahead. But without federal help, it is not going to be enough.

We were all moved by David's testimony. I only ask that you understand that the advocates in making their point used a charming and articulate little boy to distort a program. This does not reflect reality. There is no reason for David to go hungry. We in New York City simply will not countenance that - not even to provide poignant, stirring testimony.

In conclusion, I only remind you that within your hands as a member of Congress is the power to create legislation for housing and social services which would go a long way to eliminating homelessness.

Sincerely,

George Gross

U.S. House of Representatives
SELECT COMMITTEE ON HUNGER
Room H2-507 House Office Building Annex No. 2
Washington, DC 20515

March 27, 1986

Mayor Edward I. Koch
The City of New York
Office of The Mayor
New York, N.Y. 10007

Dear Mayor Koch:

I would like to respond to your concerns regarding the testimony of David Bright before the Select Committee on Hunger on March 6, 1986, expressed in your correspondence dated March 12 and 14th.

This hearing, entitled "Hunger Among the Homeless", was one of a series of Select Committee on Hunger investigations of hunger among vulnerable population groups in this nation. The homeless have been cited by many national studies as particularly vulnerable to hunger because of their dire poverty, insecure shelter and unstable lives. The eight witnesses at the Select Committee hearing focused their testimony on the problems of the increasing number of homeless families with children who are most vulnerable to the physical and mental health consequences of even short periods of hunger.

I deeply regret that the New York press focused their coverage on the plight of David Bright, one of several children who testified that morning. David was invited to the hearing along with Robert Hayes of the National Coalition for the Homeless because he had won an essay contest for homeless children in New York City. I appreciate the letter you forwarded to me from Mr. George Gross, which offered specific statistics on the services provided by New York City for homeless families such as David's. I want to assure you that it was not the intent of the hearing to fault any particular jurisdiction for this national problem.

The intent of the hearing was to investigate the accessibility and effectiveness of food assistance programs for the growing number of homeless persons. To fulfill this investigative goal we visited a shelter for homeless families in Washington, D.C. and invited eight national policy makers, advocates, service providers and homeless individuals to testify before the Select Committee. Mayor Raymond Flynn of Boston, the introductory witness and Chairman of the U.S. Conference of Mayors' Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness, provided

documentation of the extent of hunger and homelessness in major cities across the nation. He expressed particular concern for the growing number of low-income families with children who are hungry and homeless and highlighted the need for improved Federal assistance to cities to fight hunger and homelessness.

I, too, share your concern for an improved partnership between federal, state, and local governments to assist the growing number of homeless persons. To build this cooperation it is important for Federal legislators to hear from local governments and the private sector regarding the most effective programs for particular populations. I look forward to working with you and other mayors across the nation in shaping a partnership to fight hunger and homelessness. It is my belief that a solution to these problems should be a primary national concern.

I have enclosed a copy of the witness list and written testimony from the Select Committee hearing. I would welcome any testimony you would like to submit for the hearing record toward our mutual goal of ending hunger among the homeless.

Sincerely,

MICKEY LELAND
Chairman

Enclosures

THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10007

April 11, 1986

Hon. Mickey Leland
Member of Congress
H2-507 House Office Bldg-Annex No.2
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mickey:

Thank you for your response to my recent letter in which I attempted to set the record straight about New York City's efforts on behalf of the homeless. I know that your Committee's hearing was not intended to fault a particular jurisdiction for the homeless problem. Unfortunately, we in New York ended up bearing the brunt of a great deal of unfair and unfounded criticism as a result.

I am the first to admit that we are not perfect in all that we are doing. The fact remains, however, that not only are we actively seeking ways to ease the plight of the homeless, we are actually doing more for this group than any other municipality of which I'm aware.

The sincerity of your letter indicates that you do understand that we have made great strides in helping the homeless and that you share our concern.

In this spirit, let us work on a better plan to solve the homeless dilemma through federal, state and local cooperation. The limited resources of local governments have been stretched to their limits in attempts to deal with the homeless, and cannot be further eroded by cuts in such critical programs as General Revenue Sharing, and Community Development Block Grants and the elimination of state and local tax deductability.

All the best.

Sincerely,

Edward I. Koch
MAYOR

EIK/cb



BEST COPY AVAILABLE